Class
General Theological
Ninth Ave. and 20
Besides the main topic
Subject No. *On page*
270.005 J
H 394

A

COMPENDIUM

OF

CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES:

BEING A BRIEF VIEW OF THE ORDERS, RITES, LAWS AND CUSTOMS OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH IN THE EARLY AGES.

BY THE REV. C. S. HENRY, A. M.

Philadelphia:

JOSEPH WHETHAM.

M DCCC XXXVII.

270.005 J
H 394

3286

Copy 1

Entered, according to the Act of Congress, in the District Court of the District of Pennsylvania, by JOSEPH WHETHAM.

J. L. POWELL, PRINTER, BURLINGTON, N. J.

PREFACE.

It may be proper to say a few words respecting the particular design and character of the following work. It was suggested to the writer, by some friends whose eminent station in the Church entitled their judgment to great respect, that such a book as this would fill a place not occupied, and supply a want that was extensively felt. Of the great work of Bingham—the *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*—there is no American edition. Besides, it is so voluminous, as not to fall within the means or leisure of a large number of general readers, and perhaps of theological students and clergymen. It was thought it might be doing an acceptable service to such to give them the substance of that work within the compass of a moderate volume.

For such therefore as have not the work of Bingham, and still less have time or means to examine the original sources, or the special treatises of learned modern writers upon the various subjects embraced within it—the present work is designed. It makes no pretension to originality of investigation. If all the original sources had been at hand, the other occu-

pations of the writer would not have allowed a thorough examination of them. The work of Bingham has therefore been relied upon as to facts and authorities—as well as followed in its general method; still an attentive comparison will show occasionally an independent reference, and more frequently an independent exercise of judgment upon the materials brought together by Bingham. The object has been to give a brief view of whatever is most interesting in the state of the early Church. This view, as far as possible, has been confined to the three first centuries, or to the period prior to the Council of Nice. Accordingly whatever plainly relates to a period much later than that, has in general been omitted, or adduced only as illustrating the practice of the earlier times. So too in regard to the authorities cited,—they are in general such as fall within the three first centuries, or whose testimony directly or indirectly relates to that period.

In regard to the references given from Bingham—it may seem out of keeping with the object of this work, to refer to the original sources. But it occurred to the writer, that the addition of these references —without much increasing the size of the book, or diminishing its usefulness for general readers—might make it sometimes a convenient guide to scholars in pursuing an original investigation of any of the topics

to which they relate. Accordingly a selection of the most important of the authorities quoted by Bingham, has been made.

The work is committed to the candour of the public, with the hope that it may promote the cause of truth, and cherish an intelligent attachment to the constitution, discipline, and worship of that Church, which the writer believes to be most nearly, and in all its essential and peculiar principles and usages, conformed to the Apostolic and Primitive Model, and of which it is his happiness to avow himself a devoted member.

March, 1837.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/compendiumopfchr0000revc

CONTENTS.

BOOK FIRST.

CHAPTER FIRST.

NAMES AND TITLES OF MEN IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

Page.

§ 1. Appellations used and admitted by Christians themselves, . . . 17
§ 2. Names of reproach applied to Christians by Jews and Heathen, . . 18
§ 3. The several orders of men in the Christian Church, ... 19
§ 4. Special titles and privileges of the Faithful, ... 20
§ 5. Distinction between the Laity and Clergy, ... 21
§ 6. What persons called Clerici, ... 22
§ 7. Canonici, ... 23
§ 8. Order of the Sanctuary, ... 23

CHAPTER SECOND.

OF THE SUPERIOR ORDERS OF CLERGY IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH; AND FIRST, OF BISHOPS.

§ 9. Bishops, a distinct order, ... 23
§ 10. Whether of Apostolical institution, ... 24
§ 11. Titles of office and honor given to the Bishops. Apostles, . . . 26
Successors of Apostles, ... 26
Other titles, ... 27
§ 12. The offices of Bishops as distinct from those of Presbyters, . . . 28
§ 13. Power of Bishops in regard to the revenues of the Church: and official letters, ... 30
§ 14. Relation of the Bishops to the whole Catholic Church, ... 31
§ 15. Independence of Bishops, ... 31
§ 16. Qualifications of Bishops, ... 32
§ 17. Some laws and customs relating to the ordination of Bishops, . . 32
§ 18. Ordination of Bishops, ... 33
§ 19. Manner of Ordination, ... 33
§ 20. Rule against ordaining Bishops in small places, ... 34
§ 21. Of two Bishops in one city, ... 35

CHAPTER THIRD.

OF SOME EXTERNAL DISTINCTIONS AMONG THE BISHOPS: CHOREPISCOPI, METROPOLITANS AND PATRIARCHS.

Page.
§ 22. Of the Chorepiscopi, or country Bishops, ... 35
§ 23. Note—Suffragan Bishops, ... 37
§ 24. Primates, or Metropolitans, ... 37
§ 25. Offices and powers of Metropolitans, ... 38
§ 26. Of Patriarchs, ... 40
§ 27. Of the rise of the Patriarchal office, ... 41
§ 28. Of the powers of the Patriarchs, ... 41
§ 29. Of the Autocephali, or absolute Bishops, ... 43

CHAPTER FOURTH.

OF PRESBYTERS.

§ 30. The name and its application, ... 44
§ 31. Origin of Presbyters, ... 44
§ 32. Powers and privileges, ... 45
§ 33. Ancient form and manner of ordination, ... 46
§ 34. Of Archipresbyteri, ... 46
§ 35. Seniores Ecclesiæ, not of the Clergy, ... 47

CHAPTER FIFTH.

OF DEACONS.

§ 36. Deacons one of the three sacred orders, ... 47
§ 37. Ordination of Deacons, ... 47
§ 38. Offices of Deacons, ... 48
§ 39. Number of Deacons, ... 49
§ 40. Respect paid and received, ... 49

CHAPTER SIXTH.

OF ARCHDEACONS AND DEACONESSES.

§ 41. Archdeacons, ... 50
§ 42. Deaconesses, ... 51
§ 43. Offices and duties, ... 52
§ 44. How long it existed, ... 52

CHAPTER SEVENTH.

OF THE INFERIOR ORDERS OF CLERGY IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

Page.
§ 45. Number, origin, and general purpose, ... 53
§ 46.—1. Sub-deacons, ... 54
§ 47.—2. Acolythists, ... 54
§ 48.—3. Exorcists, ... 54
§ 49. Of the Energumens in reference to whom the office of Exorcist was instituted, ... 55
§ 50.—4. Readers, ... 56
§ 51.—5. Ostiarii, or door-keepers, ... 56

CHAPTER EIGHTH.

OTHER ORDERS RECKONED AMONG THE INFERIOR CLERGY.

§ 52. Psalmistæ, or Singers, ... 57
§ 53. Copiatæ, or Fossarii, ... 57
§ 54. Parabolani, ... 58

CHAPTER NINTH.

OFFICES NOT CONSTITUTING DISTINCT ORDERS, BUT PERFORMED BY THE OTHER ORDERS.

§ 55. Catechists, ... 58
§ 56. Defensores, ... 58
§ 57. Œconomi, ... 59
§ 58. Some other inferior officers, ... 59

BOOK SECOND.

CHAPTER FIRST.

ELECTIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS OF THE CLERGY.

§ 59. Primitive modes of designating men to the ministry, ... 61
§ 60. Different opinions respecting the people's power in electing the clergy, 61
§ 61. Power of the people in the elections of Bishops the same as that of the inferior clergy, ... 62
§ 62. Election of Presbyters, ... 63

Page.
§ 63. No change made by the Council of Nice, ... 63
§ 64. Exceptions to the general rule, ... 64
§ 65. Examinations and qualifications of the Clergy, ... 65
§ 66. Rules in relation to the outward condition of such as were to be ordained, ... 65
§ 67. Digamy and Celibacy, ... 66

CHAPTER SECOND.

SOME RULES AND CUSTOMS IN REGARD TO THE ORDINATION OF THE PRIMITIVE CLERGY.

§ 68. Canons to be read before ordination, ... 67
§ 69. No one to be ordained without a fixed cure, ... 67
§ 70. Bishops not to ordain in the bishopric of another, nor persons belonging to another's jurisdiction, ... 67
§ 71. Place and times of ordination, ... 68
§ 72. Ceremonies at ordinations, ... 68
§ 73. Forced ordinations and re-ordinations, ... 68

CHAPTER THIRD.

PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF THE PRIMITIVE CLERGY; THEIR MAINTENANCE AND REVENUES.

§ 74. Respect mutually paid by the clergy to each other, ... 69
§ 75. Respect paid the clergy by the state, ... 69
§ 76. Exemption from certain taxes and offices, ... 70
§ 77. Maintenance and revenues of the clergy, ... 70
§ 78. Management and distribution of Church revenues, ... 71

CHAPTER FOURTH.

RULES RELATING TO THE LIFE AND CONVERSATION OF THE CLERGY.

§ 79. Rules relating to their general character and deportment, ... 73
§ 80. General rules more especially relating to their official duties, . . 74
§ 81. Exemplary excellence of the Primitive Clergy, ... 75
§ 82. Some rules intended as exterior safeguards of the clerical character, 75

CHAPTER FIFTH.

OF THE ASCETICS, VIRGINS AND WIDOWS.

§ 83. Difference between the first Ascetics and the Monks of a later period, 77
§ 84. Virgins and Widows, ... 78

BOOK THIRD.

CHAPTER FIRST.

OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH EDIFICES.

Page.

§ 85. Names of the Churches, ... 81
§ 86. Origin of Churches, ... 82
§ 87. Style and form of the ancient Churches, ... 83
§ 88. Exterior Narthex, or Ante-temple, ... 83
§ 89. The Church proper, ... 84
§ 90. The Altar, ... 85
§ 91. Ornaments and utensils of the Altar, ... 85
§ 92. Prothesis and lesser Diaconicum, ... 86
§ 93. The Baptistery, and other outer buildings of the Church, . . . 86
§ 94. The Diaconicum Magnum, or vestry, ... 87
§ 95. Pastophoria, and other buildings, ... 88
§ 96. Organs and bells not used in ancient Churches, ... 88
§ 97. Anathemata or ornaments of the ancient Churches, ... 89
§ 98. Consecration of Churches, ... 89
§ 99. Respect and reverence paid to Churches, ... 90
§ 100. Churches as Asylums, or places of refuge, ... 91

CHAPTER SECOND.

OF CATECHUMENS AND THE FIRST USE OF CREEDS; AND OF THE THINGS CONCEALED FROM THE CATECHUMENS.

§ 101. General names, age, and mode of admission, ... 93
§ 102. Time and general method of catechetical instruction, ... 93
§ 103. Classes of catechumens, ... 94
§ 104. Method of procedure in the further training and admission of the competentes, ... 95
§ 105. The case of catechumens falling into gross sin; of dying without baptism, ... 96
§ 106. Of creeds, their names and nature, ... 96
§ 107. Of the Apostles' Creed, ... 97
§ 108. Fragments of ancient creeds.—Irenæus, ... 98
§ 109. The Creed of Origen, ... 98
§ 110. Fragments of the Creed in Tertullian, ... 99
§ 111. Fragments of the Creed in Cyprian, ... 100
§ 112. Gregory Thaumaturgus, ... 100

Page.
§ 113. Creed of Lucian the Martyr, ... 100
§ 114. Apostolical Constitutions, ... 101
§ 115. Creed of Jerusalem, ... 102
§ 116. Creed of Alexandria, ... 103
§ 117. Creed of Antioch, ... 103
§ 118. Roman Creed called the Apostles' Creed, ... 103
§ 119. Creed of Aquileia, ... 104
§ 120. The Nicene Creed as first published by the Council of Nice, . 104
§ 121. The Nicene Creed as completed by the Council of Constantinople, 105
§ 122. The Athanasian Creed, ... 106
§ 123. Of the Romish pretences concerning things concealed from the Catechumens, ... 108
§ 124. Of the things really concealed, ... 109
§ 125. The true reasons of concealing these things from the Catechumens, 110

BOOK FOURTH.

CHAPTER FIRST.

RITES AND CUSTOMS OBSERVED IN RESPECT TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF BAPTISM IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

§ 126. Names and appellations given to baptism, ... 111
§ 127. Of the matter of baptism: rejected or corrupted by some heretics, 112
§ 128. The ancient form of baptism, ... 112
§ 129. Of the administrators of baptism, ... 113
§ 130. Baptism by presbyters and deacons, ... 114
§ 131. Inferior Clergy and Laymen forbidden to baptize in ordinary cases, 115
§ 132. Yet allowed in extraordinary cases, ... 115
§ 133. Usurped and unauthorized baptism, ... 115
§ 134. The administration of baptism by women, ... 116
§ 135. Baptism by heretics, schismatics and degraded clergymen, . . . 116
§ 136. The subjects of baptism, ... 117
§ 137. Practice of infant baptism in the primitive Church, ... 118
§ 138. The time of infant baptism, ... 120
§ 139. Some questions touching infants that might be baptized, . . . 121
§ 140. Of adult baptism; what persons admitted, ... 121
§ 141. Of the time of baptism, ... 122
§ 142. Solemn times at baptizing in ordinary cases, ... 123
§ 143. Place of baptism, ... 123
§ 144. Renunciations and professions made immediately before baptism, 124

Page.
§ 145. Of Sponsors in baptism, ... 125
§ 146. Of unction in baptism, ... 126
§ 147. The sign of the Cross used in baptism, ... 126
§ 148. Of the Consecration of the water in baptism, ... 127
§ 149. The different ways of baptizing by immersion, clinic baptism, &c. 128
§ 150. Trine immersion, ... 129

CHAPTER SECOND.

OF CONFIRMATION AND OTHER CEREMONIES SUBSEQUENT TO BAPTISM AND PREVIOUS TO ADMISSION TO THE EUCHARIST.

§ 151. Time of Confirmation immediately after baptism, ... 130
§ 152. The minister of Confirmation, ... 131
§ 153. The manner of administering confirmation, ... 132
§ 154. Importance attached to it in the early Church, ... 133
§ 155. Remaining ceremonies of baptism following confirmation, . . . 133

BOOK FIFTH.

CHAPTER FIRST.

OF DIVINE SERVICE IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH: GENERAL OBSERVATIONS RELATING TO IT.

§ 156. All orders of persons not admmited to the whole service of the Church, ... 135
§ 157. Of the Missa Catechumenorum, and Missa Fidelium, or ancient Ante-communion, and communion service, ... 135
§ 158. Appellations given to divine service, ... 136
§ 159. Object of ancient religious worship: God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but no other creature, angel, or saint, ... 137
§ 160. Divine service always performed in the vernacular tongue, . . 139
§ 161. Of Liturgies, or set forms of prayer, ... 140
§ 162. Concerning the use of forms of prayer in the apostolic ages, . . 141
§ 163. The use of Liturgies in the second century, ... 141
§ 164. Use of Liturgies in the third century, ... 142
§ 165. Use of Liturgies in the fourth century, ... 143
§ 166. Use of the Lord's Prayer, ... 144
§ 167. Of sacred vestments in divine worship, ... 145
§ 168. Of postures used in divine worship, ... 146

Page.

§ 169. Of times of religious assemblies, and of the services appropriate to them, ... 148
§ 170. Of the canonical hours of prayers, ... 150

CHAPTER SECOND.

OF THE ORDER OF THE DAILY MORNING AND EVENING PRAYERS.

§ 171. Order of the Morning Service, ... 151
§ 172. Whether any Psalms and Lessons were read at daily morning prayers, ... 153
§ 173. Order of daily evening service, ... 154

CHAPTER THIRD.

OF THE ORDER OF SUNDAY SERVICE; AND FIRST, A MORE PARTICULAR ACCOUNT OF THE MISSA CATECHUMENORUM, OR ANTE-COMMUNION SERVICE.

§ 174. The Psalmody, ... 156
§ 175. A more particular account of some of the most noted hymns, . . 158
§ 176. Of the reading of the Scriptures as a part of public service, . 160
§ 177. By whom the Scriptures were read, ... 161
§ 178. Solemnities and ceremonies connected with the reading of the Scriptures, ... 172
§ 179. Of preaching in the ancient Church; by whom performed, . . 163
§ 180. Of the number and frequency of sermons, ... 164
§ 181. Of the sorts and ways of preaching, ... 165
§ 182. Some customs connected with preaching 168
§ 183. Of the prayers in the ante-communion service, ... 169
§ 184. Of the prayers for the catechumens, ... 170
§ 185. Of the prayers for the energumens, ... 171
§ 186. Prayers for the competentes, or candidates for Baptism, ... 172
§ 187. Prayers for the penitents, ... 173

CHAPTER FOURTH.

A MORE PARTICULAR ACCOUNT OF THE MISSA FIDELIUM OR COMMUNION SERVICE.

§ 188. Prayers preceding the consecration; the silent prayer, ... 175
§ 189. The "bidding prayers"—preceding the oblation. 177
§ 190. The invocation or collect preceding the oblation, made by the bishop, ... 179

Page.
§ 191. Of the offerings of the people made at the altar, ... 180
§ 192. Of the elements used in the Eucharist, common bread and wine, 182
§ 193. Of the Oblation and Consecrating Prayers, ... 183
§ 194. Of Communicants, ... 193
§ 195. The order and place of receiving the communion, ... 195
§ 196. The communion received in both kinds, ... 196
§ 197. Manner of Communicating, ... 196
§ 198. No elevation of the host for worship, ... 197
§ 199. Post-Communion service, ... 200
§ 200. Disposition of the remains of the Eucharist, ... 201
§ 201. Disposition of the other offerings of the people; Agapæ or Love Feasts, ... 202
§ 202. The preparation for worthy communicating required by the ancient Church, ... 203
§ 283. Of frequent communion, ... 204

BOOK SIXTH.

CHAPTER FIRST.

OF THE UNITY OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

§ 204. Of the Spiritual union and communion necessary to the being of the Church, ... 207
§ 205. The unity necessary to the well-being of the Church; and first of baptism, ... 209
§ 206. Unity of worship, ... 209
§ 207. The unity of subordination and obedience to the bishop, . . . 209
§ 208. Unity of submission to the discipline of the Church, ... 210
§ 209. Communion of different churches forming the unity of the Catholic Church, ... 211

CHAPTER SECOND.

OF THE DISCIPLINE OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

§ 210. The general nature and intention of discipline, ... 214
§ 211. The power of the Church originally only spiritual, ... 214
§ 212. In what the discipline of the Church consisted; first, in admonition, ... 216
§ 213. Suspension or the lesser Excommunication, ... 216

Page.

§ 214. The greater Excommunication and its effects, ... 216
§ 215. Other effects of Excommunication, ... 218
§ 216. Of the phrase "Delivering unto Satan," of the Anathemata Maranatha, and of Execrations, ... 219

CHAPTER THIRD.

OF THE PERSONS SUBJECTED TO ECCLESIASTICAL DISCIPLINE, AND OF THE CRIMES WHICH INCURRED IT.

§ 217. All members of the Church liable to discipline, ... 220
§ 218. None to be excommunicated without being heard and convicted, 222
§ 219. Excommunication after death, ... 223
§ 220. The censure of the Church not inflicted for light offences, . . . 223
§ 221. A more particular account of the greater sins, such as incurred the discipline of the Church, ... 225
§ 222. Greater crimes against the first and second Commandments: Idolatry, ... 225
§ 223. Crimes against the first and second commandments continued; the practice of forbidden arts, as Divination, Magic, and Enchantment, ... 228
§ 224. Further crimes against the first and second commandments, which subjected offenders to discipline: apostacy, heresy, and schism, ... 228
§ 225. Other crimes reckoned against the first commandment; sacrilege and simony, ... 230
§ 226. Sins against the third commandment: Blasphemy, Profane swearing, perjury, and breach of vows, ... 230
§ 227. Of Profane swearing. All oaths not forbidden, ... 232
§ 228. Of Perjury and Breach of vows, ... 232
§ 229. Violations of the fourth commandment; profaning the Lord's day, ... 233
§ 230. Great crimes against the fifth commandment; disobedience to parents, treason, contempt of the laws of the Church, . . . 234
§ 231. Great crimes against the sixth commandment; murder, manslaughter, &c. 235
§ 232. Great crimes against the seventh commandment; adultery, &c. . 237
§ 233. Great crimes against the eighth commandment; theft, fraud, oppression, &c. 239
§ 234. Great crimes against the ninth commandment; false accusations, slander, &c. 240
§ 235. Crimes against the tenth commandment; envy covetousness, &c. 240

CHAPTER FOURTH.

OF THE EXERCISE OF DISCIPLINE IN REGARD TO THE CLERGY OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

§ 236. Of the peculiar notion of Communio Ecclesiasticæ, and Excommunicatio, as applied to the clergymen, ... 241
§ 237. Of Suspension, ... 242
§ 238. Of deposition or degradation, ... 242
§ 239. Meaning of the punishment called "delivering up to the secular court." 243
§ 240. The Communio peregrina, or communion of strangers, . . . 244
§ 241. Some other special and peculiar ways of inflicting punishment on the clergy, ... 245
§ 242. Of the crimes which rendered clergymen liable to the foremen-tioned kind of discipline, ... 246
§ 243. Rules of discipline particularly applied to bishops, ... 251
§ 244. Particular rules relating to Chorepiscopi, presbyters and deacons, 252

CHAPTER FIFTH.

THE SEVERAL ORDERS OF PENITENTS; THE MODES OF PUBLIC PENANCE, AND THE SEVERAL STAGES OF REPENTANCE, IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

§ 245. Penitents divided into four classes, ... 253
§ 246. The Flentes or mourners, ... 253
§ 247. The Audientes or hearers, ... 254
§ 248. Substrati, kneelers or prostrators, ... 254
§ 249. Consistentes, or Co-standers, ... 255
§ 250. Ceremonies of penance, ... 255
§ 251. Exomologesis, or confession; not the same thing as auricular confession, ... 257
§ 262. Strictness and severity of penance, ... 257
§ 253. Discretion allowed to the bishops, ... 258

CHAPTER SIXTH.

OF ABSOLUTION, OR THE MANNER OF RECEIVING PENITENTS AGAIN TO THE COMMUNION OF THE CHURCH.

§ 254. Nature of Church absolution in general; only ministerial, not absolute; sorts of it, ... 259
§ 255. Judicial absolution or complete reconciliation of penitents, . . 260

Page.

§ 256. Some things peculiar to the reconciliation of certain heretics and schismatics, ... 261
§ 257. The time of absolution, ... 262
§ 258. The minister of discipline, ... 262

BOOK SEVENTH.

CHAPTER FIRST.

OF THE FESTIVALS OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

§ 259. Distinction of festivals, ... 265
§ 260. Of the Lord's day, ... 265
§ 261. Observation of the Sabbath, or Saturday as a festival, ... 267
§ 262. The festival of nativity, ... 267
§ 263. Of the festival of Epiphany, ... 268
§ 264. Of Easter, or the Paschal festival, ... 269
§ 265. Respect paid to Easter, ... 271
§ 266. Of Pentecost, ... 271
§ 267. Ascension Day, ... 272
§ 268. Whitsunday, ... 272
§ 269. Festivals of the Martyrs, ... 272
§ 270. Some other festivals of later date, ... 274

CHAPTER SECOND.

OF THE FASTS OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

§ 271. Of Lent—origin and time, ... 275
§ 272. Reasons and objects of Lent, ... 277
§ 273. How Lent was observed, ... 277
§ 274. The fasts of the four seasons, ... 279
§ 275. The weekly fasts of Wednesdays and Fridays, ... 280

CHAPTER THIRD.

OF THE MARRIAGE RITES OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

§ 276. Opinions of some ancient heretics concerning marriage, . . . 280
§ 277. Of the just impediments to marriage, held in the Catholic Church, 281
§ 278. Sponsalia, or espousals preceding marriage, ... 283
§ 279. Manner of solemnizing marriage, ... 284

CHAPTER FOURTH.

OF THE FUNERAL RITES OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

Page.
§ 280. Of Cemeteries or burying-places, ... 286
§ 281. Manner and time of burial, ... 287
§ 282. Preparing the body for funeral, ... 288
§ 283. Funeral ceremonies, ... 289

APPENDIX.

I.

The practice of the Church of England in regard to Lay-baptism, . . 293

II.

Attempt made at the Reformation to revive the Ancient discipline in regard to frequent communion, ... 304

III.

Account of the Exomologesis or confession used in the discipline of the Ancient Church, proving that it was a different thing from the auricular confession of the Romish Church.

§ 1. The gross mistake of those who make the Exomologesis of the ancient Church to signify auricular, ... 306
§ 2. No necessity of auricular Confession ever urged by the ancient Church, ... 308
§ 3. This proved further from the practice of the ancients in denying all manner of Absolution to some relapsing sinners, without excluding them from the Mercy and Pardon of God upon confession to Him alone, ... 312
§ 4. And from several other considerations of the like Nature, ... 315
§ 5. Yet private confession allowed and encouraged in some cases. As, 1. For lesser sins, Men were advised to confess mutually to one another, to have their Prayers and Assistance, . 318
§ 6.—2. In case of injuries done to private persons, men were obliged to confesss, and ask pardon of the injured party, ... 320

Page.

§ 7.—3. When they were under any troubles of conscience, they were advised to make private confession to a minister, to have his counsel and direction, ... 320

§ 8.—4. To take his advice also, whether it was proper to do public penance for private offences, ... 321

§ 9.—5. When there was any danger of death, arising from the laws of the State against certain offences, ... 323

§ 10.—6. Private Confession required in case of private Admonition for Offences, ... 324

§ 11. The office of the penitentiary Priest set up in many churches to receive and regulate such private Confessions, ... 324

§ 12. This office afterwards abrogated, and men were entirely left to their liberty, as to what concerned private Confession, . . 325

IV.

Index of Councils, with the number of their canons, ... 328

CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES.

BOOK FIRST.

CHAPTER FIRST.

NAMES AND TITLES OF MEN IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

§ 1. *Appellations used and admitted by Christians themselves.*

The first believers in Christianity were known among themselves by the names of *disciples*, *elect*, *saints*, and *brethren*, before they adopted the title of CHRISTIANS. There were also other appellations, of less frequent use, such as *Jesseans*, probably from Jesus; *Pisciculi*, *fishes*, from baptism, the initiatory rite of Christianity, which was also adopted from the fanciful reason that the initial letters in Greek, of the words Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our Saviour, put together make the Greek word for fish.[1]

They also sometimes adopted the title of *Gnostics*, implying that Christianity was the true wisdom and knowledge of divine things. But its perverse adoption and abuse by certain heretics, made it less frequently used.[2]

Another name for Christians frequently occurring in the ancient writers, is the Grecian compound *Theophori*, and also *Christophori*,[3] *those who bear about with them God, or Christ;* a phraseology which had reference to the divine promise: "I will dwell in them, and walk in them;" and to the language of St. Paul, in which he speaks of Christians as the "Temples of God."[4]

Ambrose and Jerome[5] speak of believers under the title of *Christi*, or *Christs*, in the sense of *anointed*, with reference to Ps. 105, 15:

---

[1] Ἰησοῦς, Χριστὸς, Θεοῦ Υἱὸς, Σωτηρ.—Tertull. de. Bapt. c. 21. Nos *Pisciculi*, secundum ἰχθυν nostrum, Jesum Christum, in aqua nascimur, &c. [2] Athanas. ap. Socrat. H. E. iv, 28. Clem. Alex. Strom. I. p. 294, &c. [3] Θεοφόροι, & χριστοφόροι. [4] Acta Ignat. ap. Grabe Spicileg. T. ii. p. 10. [5] Ambros. de ob. Valent. T. iii. p. 748.—Hieron. com. in Ps. 105.

"touch not mine anointed—*Christos meos.*" But this title was not generally adopted by Christians; they considered it sacredly appropriated to their Lord.

The early Christians were strongly averse to party names. They preferred above all others the title of Christians, as expressive of their unity and their relation to Christ. Inasmuch however as the *Heretics*, who had their respective party names, laid claim also to the title of Christians, the orthodox adopted the appellation of *Catholic*, or *universal*, to distinguish themselves from all the sects of heretics; and hence the title, Catholic Church, embraced all who held together in communion with the great body of Christians, maintaining the unity of doctrine. This name is of very ancient use, being found in the writings of Ignatius, Clemens Alexandrinus, &c.; and in such high esteem was it held, that Christians would acknowledge none, who did not profess to be of the Catholic or Universal Church.

The name *Ecclestiastics, belonging to the Church*, though mostly used to denote the clergy in distinction from the laity, was sometimes applied to Christians in general, when they were spoken of in opposition to Jews, infidels, &c.

To this it may be added, that among the heathen our Saviour's name by mistake was sometimes called CHRESTUS instead of CHRISTUS; and hence his followers were frequently called *Chrestians.* To this they did not particularly object; though they never adopted the name themselves.

§ 2. *Names of reproach applied to Christians by Jews and Heathen.*

The name of *Nazarenes* was first contemptuously applied to Christians by the Jews, (Acts 24, 5.) and from them taken up by the heathen; who also called them *Galilæans.* The emperor Julian published an edict forbidding them to be called by any other name than that of Galilæans, hoping thereby to banish the use of the title, Christians.

They were also called *impostors*, and *Greeks.* St. Jerome says,[1] that whenever a Christian was seen passing in the streets, the people would cry out "*behold a Greek impostor.*" The reason of applying the epithet Greek to that of impostor, is conjectured by some to be

[1] Hieron. Ep. 10. ad Furiam.

the use of the Grecian *pallium*, (the cloak, or philosophic dress) worn by many of the Christian teachers. Tertullian wrote a book, *de Pallio*, to expose the folly and malice of this objection. They were also called *magicians* by their enemies, in order to cast odium upon the Christian miracles. The *new superstition* was another reproachful name for Christianity. Christians were also called *Biathanati*,[1] *self-murderers*, to ridicule their readiness to suffer martyrdom; or, as Suicer (in voce) says, it may be *Biothanati*,[2] *those who expect to live after death*, and intended to ridicule the Christian doctrine of Resurrection.

Among the Romans, those who hired themselves out as gladiators, to fight with wild beasts in the amphitheatres, were called *Parobolarii*, and *Parabolani*. These names were also applied to Christians because they chose to combat with wild beasts rather than renounce their religion. In this sense Christians did not object to be thus called; but the title *Desperati*, *desperadoes*, they rejected as a calumny.—They were also reviled under the names of *Semaxii*, and *Sarmentitii*, from the board or stake, (*Semaxis*) to which they were fastened, and the faggots, (*Sarmenta*) which were used, when they were burned alive.

§ 3. *The several orders of men in the Christian Church.*

Having noticed the various names applied to distinguish Christians from Jews and heathen, it is necessary to consider the different orders of men that were recognized in the body of the Church.

St. Jerome[3] makes five: *Bishops*, *Presbyters*, *Deacons*, *Believers*, and *Catechumens*. The statement of Origen[4] comes to the same thing, where speaking of the administration of discipline in the Church, he says: "Every one shall be punished according to his degree. If a *president* of the Church (Bishop) sin, he shall have the greater punishment. A *catechumen* shall be treated with more lenity than a *believer*, a layman or believer than a *deacon*, a deacon

---

[1] Βιάθανατοι. [2] Βιόθανατοι. [3] Hieron. in Isa. 19. Quinque Ecclesiæ ordines, Episcopos, Presbyteros, Diaconos, Fideles, Catechumenos. [4] Origen. Hom. 5. in Ezek.—Pro modo graduum unusquisque torquebitur. Majorem pœnam habet, qui Ecclesiæ præsidet et delinquet. Annon magis misericordiam promeretur ad comparationem Fidelis Catechumenus? Non magis venia dignus est Laicus, si ad Diaconum conferatur? Et rursus comparatione Presbyteri Diaconus veniam plus meretur.

than a *presbyter*." Eusebius[1] includes the three orders of clergy under the general title of *rulers*, and reckons two orders of laity, the *believers* or *faithful*, and the *catechumens*.[2]

It is to be noticed that the name *believers* or the *faithful*, is here taken in a strict sense, to denote the believing and baptized *laity* in distinction both from the clergy and the catechumens. In this sense the word is used in the most ancient liturgies and canons.[3] The *catechumens*, though not admitted to all the privileges of the *faithful*, were yet reckoned as belonging in a certain sense to the Christian Church. With the catechumens were classed the several sorts of *penitents*, and the *energumens*, of whom more in another place.

§ 4. *Special titles and privileges of the Faithful.*

The *faithful* were distinguished from the *catechumens* by several *titles* of honor, of which the principal may be mentioned. They were called the *illuminati*, and the *initiated*;[4] because they were supposed to be specially enlightened by the Holy Ghost, and because they were admitted to hear discourses upon the sacraments or holy mysteries.

They were also called the *perfect*,[5] because as complete Christians they were permitted to partake of the eucharist; also *saints* (ἅγιοι), &c.

They had peculiar *privileges* to which the *catechumens* were not admitted. In the ancient service of the Church, there were no prayers preceding the communion service, except such as related to the *penitents*, to the *energumens* (as those supposed to be possessed by evil spirits were called) or to the catechumens themselves. When these prayers were ended (*missa catechumenorum*) then commenced the liturgy of the faithful (*missa fidelium*), from which the catechumens were directed to withdraw. The Lord's prayer was particularly called *the prayer of the faithful*,—(ἐυχὴ πιστῶν).

---

[1] Euseb. Demonst. Evang. vii. 2. [2] Ἡγούμενοι, rulers or governors;—Πιστοὶ, the faithful, or believers;—Κατηχουμένοι, the catechumens. [3] Conc. Nice. can. 12. Conc. Eliber. c. 12, 46, 51. Const. Apostol. viii, 24. [4] Φωτιζόμενοι, *illuminati*; μεμυημένοι, *initiati*. [5] Τέλειοι, *perfecti*. In the canons of the ancient councils the Eucharist is frequently called το τέλειον, (see conc. Ancyr. can. 4, 5, 6.) where ἐπι το τέλειον ἐλθεῖν, and τοῦ τελείου μετέχειν, means to partake of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

The privilege of partaking the eucharist was reserved exclusively for the faithful, nor were any others admitted to be spectators, except a certain advanced class of penitents, of whom in another place.

They only were permitted to hear discourses upon the profoundest points of Christian doctrine, particularly such as pertained to the sacraments. Thus Augustine, in one of his sermons to the newly baptized (*neophytes*), says: "Having now dismissed the catechumens, we have detained you alone to be our hearers, because besides those things which belong to all Christians in common, we are now to discourse more particularly of the heavenly mysteries, or sacraments, &c."[1] This is probably the just explanation in regard to every thing that has been said about Christians having had an *exoteric* or popular doctrine, and an *esoteric* or secret doctrine.[2]

§ 5. *Distinction between the Laity and Clergy.*

In the body of the Christian Church, the *Fideles*, or *baptized believers*, were not only distinguished from the *Catechumens*, but from the earliest times a distinction was also made between the laity and clergy. Clemens Romanus,[3] speaking expressly of this distinction, derives it from the Jewish economy; and there can be no doubt it was introduced into the Christian Church by the Apostles themselves. Clemens Alexandrinus, speaking of St. John, says, "that after his return from Patmos, he settled at Ephesus, whence being often invited to visit the surrounding country, he ordained bishops, and *set apart* such men for the *clergy*, as were signified to him by the Holy Spirit."[4] The word *clergy* is here obviously used as the peculiar title of those who were set apart for the service of the Church. The same word occurs indeed in 1 Pet. v. 3, as applied to the whole body of Christians, also in Deut. iv. 20, &c., as applied to the people of Israel; where they are spoken of as God's Κληροὶ, his *chosen ones*, his *lot*, or *heritage*, obviously in opposition to unbelievers or heathen. All the earliest writers, however, when speaking of persons in the

---

[1] August. Serm. i. ad Neophyt.—Demissis jam Catachumenis, vos tantum ad audiendum retinuimus quia praeter illa quae omnes Christianos convenit in commune servare, specialiter de coelestibus mysteriis locuturi sumas, &c. [2] Compare Murdock's Mosheim. vol. i. p. 98. [3] Clem. Rom. Ep. 1 ad Corinth. [4] Clem, Alex. ap. Euseb. iii, 23.

Church, use the word *clergy* as the peculiar title of a particular order of men, in distinction from the body of Christians. The most common and ancient name for the latter was *Laici*, *laymen*; which is found everywhere in the writings of Origen, Cyprian, Tertullian, and others of the third century. Origen also uses the word ἰδιῶται, *private* men to distinguish the laity from the clergy; which name, as also that of Βιωτικοὶ, *seculars*, is used in the same sense by Chrysostom,[1] and others in the following century. Thus Chrysostom, exhorting to the study of the Scriptures, says, "let no man excuse himself, by saying I am a *secular*," &c. In another place, speaking of the command of St. Paul, "let every soul be subject to the higher powers," he says, "this command is given to the clergy, and not to the *seculars* only."[2]

This distinction of titles always implied a distinction of *offices*. This is apparent from the above cited passage from Clemens Alexandrinus. Hence Ignatius so frequently, in all his epistles, directs the people to do nothing without the bishops, presbyters, and deacons; and Tertullian charges the Heretics with violating the order of the Catholic Church by confounding the offices of clergy and laity together.[3] Jerome says that was to be reckoned no church which had no priests.[4]

§ 6. *What persons called Clerici.*

The title was originally applied to the bishops, presbyters, and deacons, because these were the only officers in the Church. In the third century many subordinate orders were appointed as sub-deacons, acolythists, readers, &c., who were set apart for the exclusive service of the Church. Cyprian always gives these the name of *Clerici*; their ordinations he calls *Ordinationes Clericæ*, letters sent by their hands *Litteræ Clericæ*. The Council of Nice[5] gives this title to the subordinate ministers of the Church, as well as to bishops, presbyters, and deacons; the third council of Carthage confirms it, as a usage of language which had obtained.[6] The same council seems also to use the word as more appropriate to these inferior orders; and there can be no doubt it afterwards came into frequent use to

---

[1] Chrysost. Hom. 35. in 1 Cor. [2] Chrysost. Hom. 23. in Rom. [3] Tertull. de Prærscript. c. 41. [4] Jerom. Dial. con. Lucif. [5] Conc. Nice, Can. 3. A. D. 325. [6] Conc. Carth. III. Can. 21. A. D. 397.

distinguish them from the superior. It is so in the canons of the council of Laodicea, A. D. 361, in Ambrose, Epiphanius, and others.

§ 7. *Canonici.*

The clergy are very frequently also called *Canonici*, by the ancient councils. The name is derived from the Greek word κανὼν, signifying, among other things, the *roll* in which the list of the clergy was written. So the council of Nice. Can. 16, 17, 19. The council of Antioch, A. D. 270, calls it "*the sacred roll.*" In Cyril, κανονικῶν παρουσία means the *presence of the clergy;* in the council of Laodicea, κανονικοὶ ψαλταί, such of the clergy whose office it was to sing in the Church.

§ 8. *Order of the Sanctuary.*

Besides various other titles of obvious application such as Ecclesiastics, the sacred order, &c., one other, occurring in Gregory Nazianzen, may be mentioned, namely *the order of the Sanctuary*, (τάξις τοῦ βήματος,) applied particularly to the superior clergy, from their exclusive privilege of entering that part of the Church, βημα, where the altar stood.[1]

CHAPTER SECOND.

OF THE SUPERIOR ORDERS OF CLERGY IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH; AND FIRST, OF BISHOPS.

§ 9. *Bishops, a distinct order.*

The superior clergy were divided into three distinct orders. These at first were the only orders; the rise of the inferior orders will hereafter be noticed. In speaking of the distinction of the clergy, the primitive writers use indifferently the words, order, degree, office, power, and jurisdiction. That the bishops were a distinct and superior order is regarded as clear from the earliest writers. The first, and nearest to the apostolic times, is *Ignatius.* Passages to this

---

[1] Hence in this same writer, τῷ βήματι προσάγειν *to introduce to the Sanctuary*, means *to ordain*, to *make a clergyman*, and ὁ ἀπὸ βήματος, *one of the clergy.*

point in his epistles are too numerous to quote at large.[1] A single specimen is given. In his epistle to the Magnesians,[2] he exhorts them to do all things in unity "under the bishop presiding in the place of God; and the presbyters as the apostolical senate; and the deacons to whom is committed the ministry and service of Christ." The author of the *Acts of the Martyrdom* of Ignatius speaks of the same distinction, when he says: "that as Ignatius was on his journey to Rome, all the cities and churches of Asia sent to salute him by their bishops, presbyters, and deacons."[3] Near to this time is the testimony of *Pius*, bishop of Rome, A. D. 157, addressing Justus of Vienna, as "clothed in the Episcopal robes, and whom the presbyters and deacons are to obey."[4] In the beginning of the next century, the authorities of Clemens Alexendrinus, Origen, and Tertullian, agree to the same point. Says *Clement:* "there are in the Church the different degrees or progressions of bishops, presbyters, and deacons."[5] *Origen* in many places to the same effect: "being twice married, excludes from ecclesiastical dignities; for one that is twice married can neither be bishop, nor presbyter, nor deacon."[6] Again: "every one shall be punished according to his degree. If the supreme governor (bishop) offends, he shall have the greater punishment. A layman will deserve mercy in comparison of a deacon, and a deacon in comparison of a presbyter."[7] *Tertullian* frequently makes the same distinction. A single passage is given: "the right of baptizing belongs to the chief-priest, who is the bishop; and after him to the presbyters and deacons; yet not without the authority of the bishop, for the honour of the Church, in the preservation of which consists the Church's peace."[8] These are the kind of testimonies commonly adduced to show the acknowledgment, as a matter of fact, of bishops as a superior order to the others, in the three first ages of the Church.

§ 10. *Whether of apostolical institution.*

Whether this was so established by the apostles themselves, or afterwards by the Church, is another question. In the view of many,

---

[1] Ignat. Ep. ad Ephes. n. 2, 3, 4:—ad Philad. n. 4, 7, 10:—ad Smyrn. n. 8, 12:—ad Trall. n. 2, 7, 12, 13:—ad Polycarp. n. 6. [2] Ep. ad Magnes. n. 6. [3] Martyr. Ignat. ap. Grabe Spicil. Sæc. ii. t. i. p. 12. [4] Pius, Ep. 2 ad Just. Vien. [5] Clem. Alex. Strom. vi. 667. [6] Orig. Hom. in St. Luc. [7] Orig. Hom. in Ezek. [8] Tertull. de Bapt. c. 17.

the unanimous consent of the early writers declares for the establishment of episcopacy by the apostles under the divine direction. Tertullian says: "the order of bishops, when traced up to its original, will be found to have St. John for one of its authors."[1] This agrees with the passage before quoted from *Clemens Alexandrinus*, that John ordained bishops, and set apart men for the clergy in the region about Ephesus, under the direction of the Holy Spirit. *Jerome* is thought to refer to these when he says: "that at the request of the Asiatic bishops John wrote his Gospel."[2] Clement of Alexandria also observes, "there are many precepts in Scripture referring to particular sorts of persons; some to presbyters, some to deacons, and some also to bishops."[3] *Irenæus* has no doubt that there were bishops as well as presbyters in the days of the apostles; "for the assembly at Miletus," he says was composed of bishops and presbyters, of Ephesus and the neighbouring cities of Asia."[4] Accordingly he always derives the origin and succession of bishops from the apostles. Thus he says that "Hyginus, bishop of Rome, was the ninth of the episcopal succession from the apostles."[5] In another place, giving a catalogue of the bishops of Rome, down to his own time, he says that Linus, the first of them, was ordained bishop by the apostles; and that Eleutherius, the last of them, was the twelfth bishop from the apostles.[6] *Tertullian* insists upon the same thing, when he challenges all sorts of heretics: "let them show us the original of their churches, and give us a catalogue of their bishops in exact succession, from first to last, whereby it may appear that their first bishop had either some apostle or apostolical man, living in the times of the apostles, for his author or predecessor." "For thus it is" he goes on, "that the apostolical churches make their reckoning: the church of Smyrna counts up to Polycarp, ordained by St. John;—the church of Rome to *Clement*, ordained by St. Peter;[7]—and so all other churches, in like manner, exhibit their first bishops

---

[1] Tertull. adv. Marcion, B. iv. ch. 5. [2] Hieron. Cat. Script. Eccles. in Johan. [3] Clem. Alex. Pædag. B. iii. ch. 12. [4] Iren. B. iii, ch. 14. [5] Iren. B. i. ch. 28. [6] Ibid. B. iii. ch. 3. [7] The succession of bishops of Rome is by some reckoned back only as far as Clement, and by others to Anacletus and Linus, his predecessors, who were also successively ordained by St. Peter, and died before the ordination of Clement. Cave Hist. Lit. v. i. in Clem. Pearson de success. Rom.

ordained by the apostles, by whom the apostolical seed was conveyed to others."[1] The records and archives of the Catholic churches were doubtless extant, at the time Tertullian made this appeal.

It would be interesting if these records and lists had been preserved. Only fragments can now be collected, sufficient however to confirm the evidence that the apostles established bishops in all the churches upon their first formation.

§ 11. *Titles of office and honour given to the Bishops.*

Apostles.

The most ancient of these titles was that of apostles. This title was exclusively appropriated to the highest order of the ministry. The names, bishop and presbyter, were applied indifferently to the first and second order, according to the opinion of some; to the second order only, according to the opinion of others, while the title apostle was reserved for the first.

Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, born at Antioch about the year 386, says: "the same persons were anciently called promiscuously both bishops and presbyters, whilst those who are now called bishops, were called apostles. But shortly after, the name of apostles was appropriated to those only who were apostles indeed, [i. e. those immediately appointed by Christ;] and then the name, bishop, was given to those who before were called apostles."[2] To the same effect says the writer under the name of *Ambrose*: "they who are now called bishops, were originally called apostles; but the holy apostles being dead, those who were ordained after them to govern the churches, could not arrive to the excellency of the first; nor had they the testimony of miracles, but were in many other respects inferior to them. Therefore they thought it not decent to assume to themselves the name of apostles; but dividing the names, bishop, and presbyter, they left to the presbytery the name of presbyters, and they themselves were called bishops."[3]

Successors of the Apostles.

This feeling naturally led to another title, that of successors of the

---

[1] Tertull. Præscript. ch. 32. [2] Theod. Com. in i. Tim. 3. 1. [3] Amalarius, de offic. Eccles. ii. 13. The writings attributed to Ambrose, probably were written in the 4th century, Ambrose was made bishop of Milan, A. D. 374.

apostles. So Cyprian, Firmilian, and the bishops at the council of Carthage, A. D. 256, style themselves and others bishops.[1]

So Jerome, A. D. 386, speaking of bishops: "they are all successors to the apostles;" also, in commenting on Ps. 44, 16, styles them sons of the apostles, and princes and fathers in the Church.[2] Augustine, on the same text, says the same thing.

Hence anciently every bishop's see was called an *Apostolical See.* "The Catholic Church," says Augustine, is diffused over the world by the apostolical sees, and the succession of bishops in them." Other ancient writers use the words with the same extent of meaning.

Other titles.

The bishops, as a distinct and the highest order of ministers, were also called *Princes of the People*, *Princes of the Church.* In the works of Cyprian, Tertullian, and other early writers, they were also called Presidents, Provosts, and Inspectors.[3]

And because this presidency was over the clergy as well as the people, they were called *chief priests*, and *princes of the clergy,—Principes Sacerdotum*, *Pontifices*, *Maximi*, titles which were by no means anciently restricted to the bishop of Rome. Jerome, speaking of himself says that "in the opinion of all men he was thought worthy of the *high priesthood*,—dignus Summo Sacerdotio."[4] In another place, "the welfare of the Church depends upon the honour of the chief priest."[5]

The title *Papa*, pope, or father, was also anciently given to bishops in common. So in Tertullian. The epistles to Cyprian, have the address: *Cypriano Papæ, to Cyprian the Pope.* Jerome gives the same title to various bishops.

They were also styled *Vicars of Christ.* Cyprian says: that "every bishop is *Vice Christi*, Christ's vice-gerent, or vicar on the earth;"[6] and in several places has passages to the same effect, in which he speaks of all bishops as rulers and judges *in the place of Christ.* So Ambrose,[7] Augustine,[8] and others.

---

[1] Cypr. Ep. 69. ad Florent. Ep. 42. ad Cornel.—Firmil. Ep. 75. ap. Cypr. Conc. Carth. ap. Cypr. [2] Hieron. Ep. ad Evang. 85. Also in Ps. 44, 16. [3] Præpositi, Προεστῶτες. Πρόεδροι, Ἔφοροι. [4] Hieron. Ep. 99. ad. Asell. [5] Ibid. Dial. contr. Lucif. "Ecclesiæ salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet." [6] Cypr. Ep. Ep. 63. ad Cœcil. [7] Ambr. Com. in 1 Cor. xi. 10. [8] August. Quæst. V. & N. T. c. 127. Basil. Const. Mon. c. 22.

Another title in after times given to bishops was *angels of the Churches*,—derived from Revelations i. 20, &c. This is the interpretation of Augustine and Epiphanius.

§ 12. *The offices of Bishops as distinct from that of Presbyters.*

Under this head may be noticed a *threefold* distinction in the spiritual offices of bishops and presbyters.

1. In respect to the common offices, that is, those which might be performed by both, such as preaching, baptizing, administering the communion, &c., the bishops were regarded as performing them by an authority immediately derived from Christ; while the presbyters acted by an authority derived from the bishops, upon whom they were dependent, to whom they were subordinate as their spiritual superiors, and to whose directions they were subject in the performance of these offices.—The writings of Ignatius, Cyprian, Tertullian, and the canons of the earliest councils, are clear upon this point. Thus *Ignatius*, to the church of Smyrna: "let no one perform any ecclesiastical office without the bishop," which he explains there and elsewhere to mean without his authority and permission.[1] So the council of Laodicea says, "the presbyters shall do nothing without the consent of the bishop;"[2] the councils of Arles, and Toledo, "without his knowledge and privity."[3] The reason assigned for this by the Apostolical Canons is: "because the bishop is the man to whom the Lord's people are committed, and he must give an account of their souls."[4]

This rule was particularly applied to administering baptism and the Lord's Supper. "It is not lawful," says Ignatius, "to baptize, or celebrate the eucharist, without the bishop, but that which he allows is well pleasing to God."[5] To the same effect, Tertullian and Jerome, who say that presbyters and deacons have no power to baptize without the authority of the bishop, and that this is for the honour of the Church and the preservation of peace and unity.[6] So Am-

---

[1] Ignat. ad Smyr. n. 8. [2] Conc. Laodic. can. 56. [3] Conc. Arlet. I. can. 19.—Conc. Tolet. I. can. 20, [4] Can. Apost. can. 39. [5] Ignat. ad Smyrn. [6] *Tertull. de Bapt.* c. 17. Dandi jus quidem habet Summus Sacerdos, qui est Episcopus: dehinc Presbyteri et Diaconi; non tamen sine auctoritate Episcopi, propter Ecclesiæ honorem, quo salvo, salva Pax est. *Hieron. Dial. contr. Lucif.* 139. Inde venit, ut sine jussione Episcopi, neque Presbyter, neque Diaconus, jus habeant baptizandi.

brose; "though presbyters do baptize, yet they derive their authority from their superior."[1] It is held also that a special license to preach, was given by their superiors.[2]

2. Certain functions were reserved to the bishops, such as confirmation, consecration of churches, and ordination of the clergy. The two first are supposed to have been sometimes delegated to presbyters, but the power or function of ordaining was exclusively reserved to the bishops. In the ordination of presbyters and deacons, presbyters were allowed to lay on their hands with the bishop, but only as expressing concurrence in the act of the bishop; in the ordination of bishops, the presbyters had no part. The canons of the *earliest councils*, as that of Antioch, Nice, Chalcedon, speak of bishops as ordaining, but never of presbyters; and *Epiphanius* refers to the universal practice of the primitive church, when he says that "the order of bishops begets fathers to the church, which the order of presbyters cannot do, but only sons by the regeneration of baptism."[3] Ordinations by presbyters or pretended bishops, were disallowed and annulled, as was done by the council of Sardis,[4] and by the council of Alexandria.[5] There are cases indeed in which the ancient councils admitted the validity of orders conferred by those who were sometimes called *psuedo-bishops;* but it is clear that by these psuedo-bishops were meant *schismatical* bishops, those who had indeed received lawful consecration, but had separated from the unity of the catholic Church, or intruded into particular sees. Thus the council of Nice[6] allowed the orders of the Novatian clergy; and the African councils acknowledged the ordination of the Donatist bishops.[7]

3. Moreover, the presbyters were accountable to the bishops, but not the bishops to the presbyters. Bishops always reserved the power of calling their clergy to account and censuring them for misconduct in the discharge of their office; while the presbyters could set up no independent authority—in opposition to them. This is very clearly seen to be the case in the time of Cyprian[8]. The Apostolical Canons which throw a good deal of light on the practice

---

[1] *Ambr. de sacr.* iii. 1. Licet Presbyteri fecerint, tamen exordium ministerii a summo est Sacerdote! [2] See Bingham vol I. B. II. ch. III. §. 4. [3] Epiphan. Hæres. 75. [4] Conc. Sard. can. 20. [5] Athan. Apol. ii, p. 732. [6] Conc. Nic. can. 8. [7] Conf. Carth. 1 die. can. 16. [8] Cypr. Epp. 38 or 41. 39 or 42, &c.

of the Church in the *third* century, say, "that no presbyter or deacon excommunicated by his bishop should be received by any other."[1] The same power of inflicting ecclesiastical censures is implied in the canons of the council of Nice, though at that time the right of appeal to a provincial synod was established.[2]

Yet the power of the bishops was not abritrary, but in various respects limited and defined by canons, which at different times and places provided for the mode of proceeding and the number of neighbouring bishops whose concurrence should be had. Finally the bishops seldom did anything without the advice and concurrence of the presbyters, who were regarded as his assessors, and the ecclesiastical senate.

§ 13. *Power of Bishops in regard to the Revenues of the Church; and official letters.*

The jurisdiction of the bishops was regarded as wholly spiritual. In the primitive Church they laid no claim to civil power. They had however the disposition of the revenues of the Church, which were the oblations of the faithful and of which the bishops were regarded as God's stewards. Hence it was a part of the bishops' office to see them managed and dispensed. This they did generally by proper assistants. The councils of Antioch, and of Gangra, have several canons to this effect; the Apostolical Canons speak of the same power.[3] Thus also Cyprian[4] notices those maintained by the Church, as receiving this assistance, *Episcopo dispensante*, by the order and appointment of the bishop.

There were several sorts of official letters granted by the bishops, which went under the general title of *Litteræ formatæ*. These were generally reduced to three kinds: *Epistolæ Commendatoriæ, Communicatoriæ, and Dimissoriæ*. The first were granted to persons having occasion to travel in foreign countries. The second, to all that had occasion for them, who were in peace and communion with the Church. These were sometimes called *Pacificæ, Ecclesiasticæ;* sometimes also *Canonicæ*. The third sort were granted only to the clergy, when removing to another diocese. It was the sole

---

[1] Can. Apost. 38. [2] Conc. Nic. 5. [3] Conc. Antioch. can. 24 and 25. Conc. Gangr. can. 7 and 8. Canon. Apost. 31 and 38. [4] Cypr. Ep. 38 or 41.

prerogative of the bishops to grant all these sorts of letters; and the canons of some of the earliest councils expressly forbid presbyters to write them.[1]

§ 14. *Relation of the Bishops to the whole Catholic Church.*

The Bishops were consecrated for particular churches or sees; and for convenience and the preservation of order generally exercised their functions only within those limits. This was especially true in regard to particular acts of oversight and government. Yet there were some respects in which the bishops were regarded as belonging to the whole Catholic Church, and having a co-ordinate authority throughout the Church and the world. This was the case in regard to the preservation of the common faith and unity of the Church, and also in regard to the exercise of some of their more spiritual functions; as ordaining out of the limits of their own diocese, in extraordinary exigencies.[2]

§ 15. *Independence of the Bishops.*

In various matters however of ritual observance, discipline, &c., the bishops, within their own sees, enjoyed an absolute independence. Thus while the mode of worship was to be preserved substantially the same, and governed by the analogy of faith and sound doctrine, each bishop exercised the right of framing the expressions of the liturgies and creeds used in his churches. They also appointed days of fasting, &c., at their discretion.

In the African churches, where the episcopal independence was most asserted, the right of deciding ritual matters, and also several important points of discipline, was claimed; such as regarded the rebaptizing of heretics, admitting again to the communion a certain class of excommunicants, and clinic baptism. In these respects Cyprian's opinion and practice differed from that of others, his fellow bishops, yet he assumed no power of censuring them; "forasmuch" says he, "as every bishop, according to the liberty and power that is granted him, is free to act as he sees fit, and can no more be judged by others than he can judge them."[3]

---

[1] Conc. Antioch. can. 8. Conc. Arlet. I can. 9. [2] Cypr. de Unit. Eccl. p. 108. Hieron. Ep. 85 ad Evagr. Augustin. Contr. Pelag. in Præf. ad Bonifac.
[3] Conc. Carthag. apud Cypr. p. 229.

§ 16. *Qualifications of Bishops.*

Besides the qualifications required of bishops in common with other clergy, there were some peculiar to them. In the first place, as to their age, it was requisite they should be at least thirty years old. The council of Neocæserea, says, that a man "must not be ordained so much as a presbyter before that time."[1] Yet though this was regarded as the general rule, there were exceptions made in cases of emergency or of extraordinary merit. Thus Athanasius was made bishop of Alexandria, A. D. 326, a few months after the council of Nice: and when, from what is said of his being too young to remember the persecution under Maximian, A. D. 303, he could scarcely be supposed to be thirty years old.[2]

Another thing generally insisted on in the earliest times of the Church was that the bishop should be one of the clergy of the church or diocese over which he was to preside. Thus Cyprian says; "the bishop was to be chosen in the presence of the people, who had perfect knowledge of every man's life and actions, from his living among them."[3] Jerome observes that "it was the constant custom of Alexandria, for the presbyters of the church to choose a bishop out of their own body."[4] There were exceptions to this however, in cases where the Church could be benefitted by translating a bishop from one see to another; and also, where there was a want of unanimity in fixing upon one of their own body.

Another general rule, though not unfrequently broken, was that the bishops should first go through the inferior orders of the ministry. To this effect the council of Sardis has an express canon. Instances are not wanting, however, of laymen being ordained bishops, as Ambrose of Milan.

§ 17. *Some laws and customs relating to the ordination of Bishops.*

When any bishopric became vacant, it was thought important to fill it as soon as possible. In the African churches a year was the utmost limit of time allowed for this purpose. In these churches there was a particular officer appointed for the temporary administration of the church, whose business it was to promote and hasten

---

[1] Can. 11. [2] Athan. Ep. ad Solitar. tom 1. p. 853. [3] Cypr. Ep. 68. al. 67. ad Frat. Hisp. [4] Hieron. Ep. 85. ad Evagr.

the election of a bishop; he himself being inelligible. Neighbouring bishops were commonly appointed to this office and were called *interventors* or *intercessors*.[1] In other churches the time was shorter. The council of Chalcedon required the ordination of a new bishop within three months.[2]

In some places it was the custom to proceed to the election of a successor, immediately upon the death of the bishop, "in order to preserve peace, and avoid running into factions."[3] Yet it sometimes happened in times of difficulty and persecution that the bishoprics remained a considerable time vacant.

§ 18. *Ordination of Bishops.*

At the ordination of a bishop the presence of all the bishops of the province was required, if they could conveniently attend. If not, their assent in writing was requisite. In such cases the presence of three bishops, with the assistance or consent of the metropolitan, was a sufficient canonical number to perform the consecration. Cyprian speaks of it as the general custom of the Church in his time to have the presence of the bishops of the province.[4] So the council of Nice requires, but, on account of the inconvenience sometimes attending this, adds: "that three bishops should be sufficient to ordain, provided the metropolitan and the rest sent their consent in writing."[5] The first council of Arles, and the third of Carthage, require three, besides the metropolitan.[6] The Apostolical Canons allow the ordination to be performed "by two or three bishops."[7] Ordinations indeed by one bishop, though not canonical, were generally allowed to be valid; yet most of the ancient canons, and the general practice of the Church, required three.

Bishops, by the almost universal custom of the Church, were to be ordained in their own churches and in the presence of their own people.

§ 19. *Manner of Ordination.*

The manner of ordination is thus described by one of the councils of Carthage: "when a bishop is ordained, two bishops shall hold

---

[1] Conc. Carth. 5. can. 8. [2] Conc. Chalc. can. 25. [3] Epiphan. Hær. 69. [4] Cypr. Ep. 68. al 67. ad Frat. Hisp. [5] Conc. Nic. can. 4. [6] Conc. Arelet. I. can. 21.—Carth. III. can. 39. [7] Can. Apost. can. 1.

the book of the Gospels over his head, and whilst one pronounces the blessing or consecration-prayer, the rest of the bishops shall lay their hands upon his head." The author of the Apostolical Constitutions gives one of the ancient forms of consecrating prayer, which closes in these words: "Grant to him, O Lord Almighty, by thy Christ, the communication of thy Holy Spirit, that he may have power to remit sins according to thy commandment, and confer orders according to thine appointment, and to loose every bond according to the power which Thou gavest to the Apostles; that he may please Thee in meekness and a pure heart, constantly, blamelessly, and without rebuke; and may offer unto Thee that pure unbloody sacrifice, which Thou by Christ hast appointed to be the mystery or sacrament of the new covenant, for a sweet smelling savour, through Jesus Christ, thy Holy Son, our God and Saviour, by whom be glory, honour, and worship to Thee, in the Holy Spirit, now and forever. Amen."[1] It is not necessary to suppose precisely the same form of words in all the churches.

The consecration being ended, the bishops present conducted the newly ordained bishop to his episcopal chair, or throne, as it was generally called, and placing him there, saluted him with a sacred fraternal kiss. Then the Scriptures being read, the new bishop made a discourse upon them, which was usually called the *enthroning sermon* (*sermo enthronisticus*).

It was usual for bishops, immediately after their instalment, to send circular letters announcing the same to foreign bishops, and to receive in return letters of peace and communion. The neglect of this custom was considered as a sort of refusal to hold communion with the rest of the world. These circulars were called *litteræ enthronisticæ*, also *communicatory letters*, and sometimes *synodical letters*.

§ 20. *Rule against ordaining Bishops in small places.*

A law against placing bishops in small cities or villages was first passed by the council of Sardis,—which says: "it shall not be lawful to place a bishop in a village or small city, where a single presbyter will be sufficient; for in such places there is no need to set a bishop, lest the name and authority of bishops be brought into contempt."[2]

---

[1] Const. Apost. lib. viii. c. 5. [2] Conc. Sardic. can. 6.

But it is to be observed that, from the distance at which many such small places were situated from other cities or villages, and from other causes, this rule was never very generally observed.

§ 21. *Of two Bishops in one city.*

Another rule however which generally obtained, was that which forbid two bishops to be ordained for one city, though there might be many presbyters. This is in accordance with the express language of Cyprian;[1] and with the general strain of Ignatius. The council of Nice also repeats and confirms this ancient rule.[2]

Yet there were some *exceptions* to this rule. 1. Two bishops were sometimes allowed by a compromise in order to end a dispute, or prevent schism.[3] 2. In case of the infirmity or old age of a bishop, an assistant might be ordained, to be subordinate to him while he lived, and to succeed him, when he died.[4] 3. There is another opinion which supposes that during the apostolical age two bishops were sometimes ordained in the same city, one over the *Jewish*, and another over the *Gentile* converts. The opinions of the learned are divided on this point.[5]

Thus far we have considered bishops as equal to each other, having the same spiritual office, and, in the performance of its appropriate spiritual functions, co-ordinate and independent of each other, and subject alike only to the canons of the Church.

It is now necessary to consider some peculiar distinctions which obtained among them with reference to the *external* polity of the Church.

CHAPTER THIRD.

OF SOME EXTERNAL DISTINCTIONS AMONG THE BISHOPS: CHOREPISCOPI, METROPOLITANS, AND PATRIARCHS.

§ 22. *Of the Chorepiscopi, or country bishops.*

Besides the coadjutors or assistant bishops, ordained to assist the

---

[1] Cypr. Ep. 55. al. 59. ad Cornel. [2] Conc. Nic. can 8. [3] Theodoret. lib. v. c. 3. [4] Euseb. lib. vi. c. 11. [5] Pearson, Vind. Ignat. pt. II. c. 13. Coteler. Not. in Const. Apost. lib. vii. c. 46.

bishops in the cities when disabled by age or infirmity, the spread of Christianity and the increase of converts in the surrounding regions, led to the creation of another sort of assistants, called *Chorepiscopi*, or *rural bishops*. Concerning the nature of this office there has been a difference of opinion among the learned. 1. Some consider them as merely presbyters. 2. Others think there were two sorts of them, the one having had episcopal ordination, the other being simple presbyters. They allow that some of the chorepiscopi were made bishops before they were appointed chorepiscopi. And it is true that bishops were sometimes consecrated for a particular diocese, but from not being acknowledged by the people, or from persecution, or other cause did not assume or retain their sees. Such persons (called by ancient writers and canons, *vacant bishops*)[1] were admitted to act as *chorepiscopi* under any bishop that would receive them. The council of Nice[2] made a like provision for such of the schismatical Novatian bishops as should return to the unity of the Catholic Church: "that the bishop of the place should admit them either to the office of city presbyter, or to that of a *chorepiscopus*, that there might not be two bishops in one city." The same council determined, in relation to the Miletian bishops, "that upon their return to the unity of the Church, they should be allowed to officiate in subordination to the bishops of the Catholic Church."[3] But while admitting, that in such cases, the chorepiscopi were also properly bishops, some writers assert that there were also others who were only presbyters.

3. The third opinion, held by Hammond, Beverege, Cave, Bingham, and others, is that they were all properly bishops. They refer to Athanasius, as making a plain distinction between presbyters and chorepiscopi;—where, speaking of Mareotis, a region around Alexandria, he says that "all the churches of that region were immediately subject to the bishop of Alexandria, and never had either bishop or *chorepiscopus* among them, but only presbyters, fixed each in their respective villages or churches.[4]

It is admitted however that in the exercise of their functions they were in several respects *subordinate* to the central bishop. Their

---

[1] Socrat. Hist. Eccl. b. iv. c. 7. Conc. Antioch. can. 16. [2] Conc. Nice. can. 8. [3] Conc. Nic. Ep. Synod. ap. Socr. H. E. b. 1. c. 9. [4] Athanas. Apol. II. t. i. p. 802.

duty was to preside over the country clergy, inquire into their conduct, and make reports to the city bishop. They had power to ordain readers, sub-deacons, and other *inferior* clergy for their districts, and also deacons, and presbyters, but these latter, not without the special leave of the city bishop. This is expressly ordered by the council of Antioch.[1] They had power to confirm the newly baptized in the country churches—to grant canonical and irenical letters to the country clergy removing from the diocese—as well as some other powers not allowed to simple presbyters.[2]

The power of the chorepiscopi varied very much at different times and in different places. It began to decline in the fourth century, when the council of Laodicea set up the office of *itinerant presbyters*,[3] ordaining that "for the future no bishops should be placed in the country villages, but only *visiting presbyters;* and that such bishops as were already constituted should do nothing without the consent of the city bishop." Yet though the office of chorepiscopi continued for a time in many places, with diminished powers, it was gradually declining, till in the ninth century it became extinct.

§ 23.—*Note.—Suffragan Bishops.*

The chorepiscopi are not to be confounded with the ancient *suffragan* bishops. These were city bishops, and had this title only in reference to the primate, or metropolitan bishop of a province, and because they met at his summons to give their *suffrage*, advice, or concurrence, in a provincial synod.

§ 24. *Primates or Metropolitans.*

With a view to the preservation of order and union, the bishops of a province were led to invest one of their number with peculiar powers, whom they named the primate or metropolitan, that is principal bishop of the province. Usher and other writers derive this from apostolical constitution; and Eusebius and Chrysostom appear to have considered Timothy and Titus as having this peculiar power respectively in the provinces of Asia Minor and Crete.[4] The bishops

---

[1] Can. 10. [2] Conc. Riens. can. 3.—Conc. Antioch. can. 8.—Conc. Neocæs. can. 13. 14. [3] πεμδευται Conc. Laodic. can. 57. [4] Euseb. H. E. l. III. c. 4. Chrysost. Hom. 1. in Tit. Hom. 15. in 1 Tim.

of Cyprus, at the council of Ephesus [1] claimed that the privileges of their metropolitan were as ancient as the apostles.

Dr. Cave and others doubt the apostolical origin of this office, but consider it as commencing not long after the Apostolic age. It certainly must have existed long before the council of Nice, for there is a canon having express relation to it, prefaced by the language: "*let the ancient customs be continued.*" [2]

The *name* indeed of metropolitan scarcely occurs in any ancient writings before the council of Nice. In the Apostolical Canons they are styled *chief bishops* and *heads of the province.*[3] In some places they were called archbishops, before that name was appropriated to the patriarchs. The council of Sardis styles them *exarchs of the province.*[4] The third council of Carthage,[5] orders that they shall be called *primæ sedis Episcopus*, that is *Primate.*

In the African church these primates were also called *Patres senes, senior fathers,* because the oldest bishop always succeeded to the office of metropolitan by virtue of his seniority, wherever he might reside. But in other countries the bishop of the metropolis of the province held the office. In Africa seniority was reckoned with reference to the time of consecration; and hence registers of consecrations were required to be kept in the metropolitan church. According to these, precedence in the provincial councils was also regulated.

So far as regarded dignity and precedence, though not official power, there was a sort of *honorary primates*, to whom peculiar deference was paid. These were composed of the oldest bishop of a province next to the metropolitan, of the bishops of some ancient mother-churches, &c.

The metropolitans were at first chosen and consecrated by the bishops of their own province in synod. This continued to be the practice until the setting up of the *Patriachal* office, and then they were ordained by the patriarchs.

§ 25. *Offices and Powers of Metroplitans.*

1. They were to regulate the elections of all the bishops of their province, and to ordain them or authorise their ordination. No bi-

[1] Conc. Eph. Act. 7. [2] Conc. Nic. can. 6. [3] Apost. Can. 35. Πρῶτοι, and Κεφαλαὶ. [4] Conc. Sard. can. 6. [5] Can. 26.

shop was to be elected or ordained without their consent; otherwise, says the council of Nice, his ordination is null and void.[1] The same council declares that the "ratification of all that is done belongs to the metropolitan in every province."[2] The same rule is laid down by other councils, some before, and some in the next age after, the council of Nice.[3] The second council of Carthage says: "no one shall presume to ordain a bishop without consulting the primate of the province and taking his precept, though many other bishops should join with him."[4] The third and fourth councils of Carthage require either the presence or the commission of the primate. This power continued unimpaired after the setting up of patriarchs and was expressly confirmed by the council of Chalcedon.[5] Yet this power was not regarded as absolutely arbitrary, but to be exercised in harmony with a major vote of the provincial synod. So speak the councils of Arles and Nice.[6]

2. It was also the metropolitan's office to preside over the provincial bishops, to interpose and decide in case of controversies between them; to receive appeals from presbyters and deacons against the decisions of their bishops, and to appoint special commissions for determining them, or to refer them to the provincial synod; which latter was the more general practice. In later times indeed the metropolitans had the power of deciding without a synod.

3. Another power of the metropolitans was to call provincial synods and preside in them. No bishop of the province could disregard the summons, under pain of suspension or some canonical censure, at the discretion of the metropolitan and council.[7]

4. It was their office to publish and disperse the canons of general councils, and other laws made for the common good of the Church; also to see them observed, exercising the general powers of inquiry and visitation throughout the province. This power did not however extend to the performance of such official acts as the bishop might himself perform alone, as the ordaining of deacons, presbyters, &c.

5. They granted letters to their provincial bishops when going to foreign parts. The third council of Carthage expressly provides

---

[1] Conc. Nice. can. 6. [2] Ibid. can, 4. [3] Conc. Antioch. can. 19. Arelet. II. c. 5 and 6. Laodic. c. 12. Sardic. can. 6. &c. [4] Conc. Carth. II. can. 12. [5] Conc. Chalc. Act. 16. [6] Conc. Arelat. II. c. 5. Nice. Can. 6. [7] Conc. Chalced. can. 19.

"that no bishop should go beyond sea without consulting his primate, and taking his letters of concession and commendation.

6. They had the care of all vacant sees within their province, to administer the affairs of the church during vacancy, and secure a speedy election to fill it.

7. It belonged to the metropolitan to calculate the time of Easter, and to give notice of it to his suffragans. The duty of composing the cycle was especially committed by the Nicene council to the bishop of Alexandria; yet some care and duty in respect to it still fell upon the metropolitans.

The power of the metropolitans greatly increased in after times. They had the right, by some of the later canons, of consecrating all the churches in their respective provinces, and by others, of prescribing to the bishops the forms and rites of service; both which in earlier times were rights of the bishops, and subject to no limitation unless it were the order of a provincial council.

§ 26. *Of Patriarchs.*

As the connection and consociation of the churches of particular civil provinces led to the union of the different episcopal sees within its limits into an *ecclesiastical province* under one metropolitan bishop, so by an extension of the same thing, the several provinces of a whole *imperial diocese* were united under one head-bishop, who was called the *Patriarch*, and had a certain superiority over all the metropolitans and bishops of the diocese. The *name* of patriarch does not indeed appear to have been recognized by any public authority of the Church previous to the council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451;[1] and the first private writer who uses it is Socrates, who wrote his history about 440, or eleven years before the council of Chalcedon.[2] But the *office* and *power* appear to have been known by other names. Thus the name of *archbishop* seems to have denoted a bishop superior to a metropolitan, and having a wider jurisdiction.[3] The council of Chalcedon also gives this name to those whom it styles at other times patriarchs.[4] They were also called *Exarchs of a Diocese*,[5] to distinguish them from metropolitans who were only *Exarchs of a Province*.[6]

---

[1] Conc. Chalced. Act. 2. [2] Socrat. H. E. lib. v. ch. 8. [3] Justin. Novell. 11. [4] Conc. Chalc. Act. 16.—Act. 4. can. 30. [5] Ἔξαρχοι τῆς διοικήσεως. [6] Ἔξαρχοι τῆς ἐπαρχίας.

§ 27. *Of the rise of Patriarchal Office.*

It is generally agreed that this power existed much earlier than the time when the name first occurs in Socrates. But different opinions are held concerning the precise time of its commencement. 1. Some carry it up to the apostolic times; as Baronius, Valesius, Richerius. 2. Others fix it after the apostolic age, but some time before the council of Nice; as Spalatensis, Brerewood, &c. 3. Others, again, are of opinion that it was first instituted by the council of Nice. So Balzamon, and the later Greek writers. 4. And others, that it was not known in the Church till about the time of the second general-council of Constantinople, A. D. 381. So Basnage, Cave, Beverege, and others.

It is difficult to decide where the truth lies. It is not likely that the patriarchal power was established in all places at the same time. Certain it is that before the council of Nice, the jurisdiction of the bishop of Alexandria extended over the whole imperial *Diœcesis Ægyptiaca*, which comprised *six large provinces*. The only question then is, whether there were proper *metropolitan* bishops, presiding over the bishops of those provinces, and at the same time subordinate to the bishop of Alexandria. This however it is not easy to decide. In the next age it is certain that he had at least ten proper metropolitans under him.[1]

The most probable opinion on the general question, is that the patriarchal power grew up gradually before the time of the council of Nice, and that it was canonically confirmed by that council.[2] In subsequent times the system was in various respects extended and matured. Of this the records of the next age are abundant proof. Three general-councils have various canons in relation to patriarchates; the general council of Constantinople, A. D. 381; Ephesus, A. D. 431; of Chalcedon, A. D. 451.

§ 28. *Of the powers of the Patriarchs.*

The powers of the patriarchs were not exactly the same in all places nor at all times, but were affected in various ways by ancient

---

[1] Liberat. Brev. c. 12. Conc. Chalc. Act. I. [2] See Bingham, Chr. Antiq. B. II. ch. 17. § 6, 7, 8.

customs, both political and ecclesiastical, and also by the influence of the imperial authority after the time of Constantine.

The patriarchs of *Constantinople* and of *Alexandria*, enjoyed each some peculiar rights and privileges not possessed by the other patriarchs. The patriarch of Constantinople acquired, first by consent, and afterwards by canon, a sort of jurisdiction over the dioceses of Asia and Pontus as well as his own—receiving appeals from the patriarchs of those dioceses, and ordaining the provincial metropolitans. The patriarch of *Alexandria*, had a peculiar power, not enjoyed by any other—that of ordaining not only his metropolitans, but also the suffragan bishops under those metropolitans.

But leaving these peculiar cases, it is proper to remark upon the powers and privileges of the patriarchs generally.

1. They ordained the metropolitans of their own diocese, and received their own ordination, not from a provincial, but from a *diocesan* synod.

2. As the metropolitans convoked provincial synods, so the patriarchs had the power of convening all the metropolitans, and all the bishops of the several provinces into a diocesan synod, and of presiding in it.

They received and tried appeals from metropolitans and from provincial synods.[1]

4. They had the right of censuring metropolitans, and their suffragans, when the metropolitans were remiss in doing it.[2]

5. They might appoint metropolitans as their commissioners, to inquire and determine in various matters coming under the supervision of the patriarchal office.

6. They were to be consulted, in all matters of great moment, by their metropolitans, who were canonically under the general obligation of not acting without their patriarch.

These are the chief points of patriarchal privilege. Originally the patriarchs were all co-ordinate and independent of each other. It is reckoned[3] that there were in the earlier period *thirteen* or *fourteen* independent patriarchs, namely, one in the capital city of every imperial diocese: the patriarch of Alexandria, over the Egyptian dio-

---

[1] Conc. Chalced. can. 9. Ibid. can. 17. [2] Justin. Novell. 123. c. 22.
[3] Brerewood, Patr. Gov, 2. 1.

cese; the patriarch of Antioch, over the Eastern diocese; the patriarch of Ephesus, over the Asiatic diocese; the patriarch of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, over the Pontic diocese; of Thessalonica, over Illyricum Orientale; of Sirmium, over Illyricum Occidentale; of Rome over the Roman prefecture; of Milan, over the Italic diocese; of Carthage, over the African diocese; of Lyons over the Gallic diocese; of Toledo, over the Spanish diocese; of York, over the British diocese.

In after times many changes were introduced. The power and jurisdiction of some of the patriarchs was greatly increased. The patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople, in particular, and also of Alexandria, of Antioch, and of Jerusalem or Aelia (which was after a while erected into a patriarchate) acquired, from various causes, a degree of importance and superiority over the others. Still it appears that the *lesser* patriarchs, though rendered in some respects subordinate to these five, retained the title of patriarchs or exarchs, and sat and voted in general councils immediately after the five great patriarchs and continued also to receive appeals from their metropolitans.

§ 29. *Of the Autocephali, or absolute Bishops.*

This title, signifying *absolute* or *independent*, (ἀυτοκέφαλοι,) was given to various sorts of bishops.

1. Before the sitting up of patriarchs, *all metropolitans* were absolute, having the ordering of the affairs of their respective provinces, and responsible only to a provincial synod, and that only in case of heresy or great crime against religion or the constitution of the Church.

2. Some metropolitans retained this independence after establishment of patriarchs; receiving their ordination, not from a patriarch, but from a provincial synod, deciding controversies in their provincial synods, with no superior but a general-council. Such were the metropolitans of Cyprus, Iberia, &c.

3. A third sort of *Autocephali* were such bishops as had no metropolitan over them, but were subject immediately to the patriarch of the diocese. No notice of these however occurs earlier than the ninth century; but at that time there were many such bishops in all the large patriarchates.

4. A fourth sort has been supposed, namely, certain bishops who had no suffragan bishops under them, nor any superior over them,

neither metropolitan nor patriarch. Of this sort is reckoned the bishops of Jerusalem, before they were made patriarchs. But such instances were uncommon.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

OF PRESBYTERS.

§ 30. *The name and its application.*

The name of presbyters, or elders, is borrowed from the Greek translation of the Old Testament, (πρεσβύτεροι); and though in its primary signification it has reference to *age*, yet, as Jerome observes, it is a name of office and dignity, and not a mere indication of a man's age;[1] just as senator among the Romans, and alderman in the English language are titles of office.

In this large sense, as signifying ministers of the word and sacraments of Christ, bishops were sometimes called presbyters in the New Testament; while presbyters, from having some care and oversight in the Church, were called bishops, though in this case, when it was desired to mark the distinction between them and the superior order, the latter were called apostles, chief-priests, &c. The presbyters had likewise the name of *priests*, though this title was not exclusively appropriated to them as it is at present.

§ 31. *Origin of Presbyters.*

Admitting the general opinion that presbyters were of apostolic institution, it would seem, however, from some things said by Clemens Romanus and Epiphanius, that the three orders were not settled in every church immediately upon its first formation, but while in the larger and more populous churches, as Ephesus, bishops, presbyters and deacons, were settled by the apostles—in some of the smaller ones, there were for a short time either bishops and deacons without presbyters, or presbyters and deacons without bishops.[2]

---

[1] Hieron. in Isa. 3. [2] Epiphan. Hær. 75. Pearson. Vind. Ignat. Pt. II. c. 13. Dr. Hammond, Annot. or Acts 11, 30, advances the opinion that presbyters were not instituted till just after the Scripture times.

§ 32. *Powers and Privileges.*

In virtue of their ordinary power, acting however in dependence upon, and subordination to the bishop, they might perform, as has been intimated, the offices of preaching, baptizing, administering the eucharist, in the bishop's absence, or in his presence.

They might also reconcile penitents and grant them absolution in the bishop's absence. It is thought too by some, that in particular cases of necessity, they might administer confirmation, by special license of the bishop; but of this more hereafter.

It was moreover a part of the respects due to their office that the bishop scarcely did any thing in the government of the Church without the counsel and amicable concurrence of his presbyters.

They also had the privilege, not allowed to deacons—of sitting in the church, with the bishop, on elevated seats (called *thrones*) which were distinguished from the bishop's by being lower and called *second* thrones.[1] In reference to this common custom, Constantine, summoning the bishop of Syracuse to the council of Arles, bids him to bring also with him "two of the second throne," that is, two presbyters.[2] From the manner in which their seats were placed, in a semicircle on each hand of the bishop, (whose seat was hence sometimes called the *middle* throne) Ignatius and the Apostolic Constitutions term the presbyters the "*spiritual crown or circlet of the presbytery*," and the "*crown of the Church*."[3]

The writings of the first ages of the Church afford abundant proof of the harmony between the bishops and presbyters: and that the latter were universally regarded as the bishop's council and the ecclesiastical senate. Their concurrence with the bishop was requisite in ordination and in deposition; and they sat in consistorial and provincial councils. It is generally considered that the power of presbyters was somewhat diminished in the fourth century, yet it appears that they still continued to join with the bishops in the imposition of hands in the ordination of presbyters;[4]—to sit in consistory with their bishops;[5]—and in the provincial synods;[6]—and also in the opinion of some in the general councils;—though this last is disputed.[7]

---

[1] Greg. Naz. Carm. de vita. [2] Ap. Euseb. lib. 10. c. 5. [3] Ignat. Ep. ad Mag. § 13.—Const. Apost. lib. II. c. 28. [4] Conc. Carth. 4. c. 3. [5] Synes. Ep. 57. [6] Conc. Eliber. Prooem.—Conc. Arelat. 1. &c. [7] Burnet, Vind. Ordin. Pref. p. 32. See Bingham, B. II. ch. 19. § 13.

§ 33. *Ancient form and manner of Ordination.*

Presbyters were ordained by the imposition of hands and a consecrating prayer. The manner is described in a canon of the council of Carthage, cited before. "When a presbyter is ordained, while the bishop pronounces the benediction, and lays his hand upon his head, all the presbyters that are present shall lay their hands by the bishop's hand upon his head also." The author under the name of Dyonesius describes it in this manner. "The person to be ordained kneeled before the bishop at the altar, and he, laying his hand upon his head, did consecrate him with an holy prayer, and then signed him with the sign of the cross; after which the bishop and the rest of the clergy that were present gave him the kiss of peace." [1]

As to the form of the ordaining prayer, it is to be observed that there does not appear to have been any particular form universally observed, the bishops framing each his own liturgy. The only form now extant is found in the Apostolical Constitutions, and is in these words: "Look, O Lord, upon this thy servant who is chosen into the presbytery by the suffrage and judgment of all the clergy, and fill him with the Spirit of grace and counsel, that he may help and govern thy people with a pure heart; in like manner as thou hadst respect to thy chosen people, commanding Moses to make choice of elders, whom thou didst replenish with thy Spirit. And now, Lord, do the same thing, preserving in us the never failing spirit of thy grace; that he being full of healing powers, and instructive discourse, may with meekness teach thy people, and serve Thee sincerely with a pure mind, and willing soul, and unblamably perform the sacred services for thy people, through Christ, &c." [2]

§ 34. *Of Archipresbyteri.*

Mention is sometimes made in ancient writers of archipresbyters. Jerome seems to say there was sometimes one in a church, and but one. The office is spoken of by Socrates and Sozomon. It seems to have been an appointment made by the bishop—and not by the church, nor necessarily resulting from seniority; and the presbyter so designated seems to have had some charge next to the bishop and

[1] Dyones, de Eccles. Hierarch, Ch. v. pt. 2. p. 364. [2] Const. apost. B. viii. ch. 16.

under him. These are not to be confounded with the *cardinales presbyteri*, which is a name of much later date, in the Roman church.

§ 35. *Seniores Ecclesiae, not of the Clergy.*

A class of persons under this name are mentioned in several early writers, about whose character there has been some doubt. From all that can be gathered, they were not of the clergy ; but answered most nearly to the modern vestry and wardens—having the charge of sacred vessels and other property of the church.[1]

CHAPTER FIFTH.

OF DEACONS.

§ 36. *Deacons one of the three sacred orders.*

This is attested by the whole current of antiquity. Ignatius expressly styles them "ministers of the mysteries of Christ,"—adding "that they are not ministers of meats and drinks only, but of the Church of God."[2] In many other places to the same effect—requiring the people to be subject to them, and to reverence them as Jesus Christ," that is, as his ministers. Cypian speaks of them in the same way, as "ministers of the episcopacy and of the Church."[3] Tertullian joins them with bishops and presbyters, as guides and leaders of the laity, and makes them in their degree overseers as pastors of the flock of Christ.[4] Augustine in one of his epistles gives Præsidius the title of *consacerdos*, *fellow-priest*, whom Jerome immmediately after speaks of as a deacon.[5]

Yet it is to be noted that the deacons were not generally styled *priests*, but only *ministers*, the former word being reserved to the two first orders, and particularly to the presbyters. They were frequently distinguished from priests by the term levites.

§ 37. *Ordination of Deacons.*

The ordination of a deacon differed both in form and manner from

---

[1] Optat. lib. I. p. 41.—Albaspin. not. in Opt. p. 123 [2] Ignat. Ep. ad Trall. n. 2. [3] Cypr. Ep. 65. or 3. ad Rogat. [4] Tertull, de Fuga. ch. 11. [5] Aug. Ep. 16.—Jerome Ep. 17 inter Epist. August.

that of presbyters and also in the powers conferred. The ordination might be performed by the bishop alone; because as the council of Carthage says "he was ordained not to the priesthood, but to the inferior services of the church."[1]

§ 38. *Offices of Deacons.*

These were to take care of the sacred table and the untensils pertaining to the eucharist—to receive the oblations of the people and present them to the priest—to read the Scriptures, and in some churches to read the gospel in the anti-communion service;[2] though the Apostolical Constitutions speak of this latter as belonging to the priests alone.[3] It was more appropriate to their office to assist the bishop or priest in ministering the consecrated elements to the people. The Apostolical Constitutions describe the manner. The bishop or priest consecrated the elements and ministered the bread, saying, "the body of Christ," the deacon ministered the cup saying, "the blood of Christ, the cup of life." The deacons did this only however by the allowance of the bishop or priest; and the council of Nice forbids a presbyter to receive the sacrament from a deacon. Deacons were not to consecrate, but only to distribute, and that only to the people, and by license of the priest or bishop.

There is some difference among ancient writers, as to whether deacons had the right of baptizing by license of the bishop, as a part of the *ordinary* powers of their office. It seems to have been the fact that they had. It is to be remembered that in *extraordinary* cases, this is supposed to have been the right of the inferior clergy and of the laity.

The deacons had a certain direction in various parts of the public service of the Church, using a form of words to give notice called "bidding to prayers," to call the attention of the people, to direct the catechumens and unbelievers to depart, when the sermon was ended, &c.

They were allowed to preach by license and authority from the bishop, but never without it. In extraordinary cases of extreme necessity they might reconcile penitents and grant them absolution, and also suspend the inferior clergy, as sub-deacons, singers, &c., powers which ordinarily belonged only to the bishops or presbyters.

---

[1] Conc. Carth. IV. c. 37. [2] Hieron. Ep. 57, [3] Const. Apost. lib. II. ch. 57.

It was also the office of deacons to attend upon their bishops at councils; sometimes they represented them, in the general-councils, not being however generally permitted to sit with the bishops and presbyters; though this was allowed in the Eastern councils. In the consistorial and provincial synods, deacons sometimes gave their vote in their own name.

The deacons were empowered to rebuke and correct improper conduct in church. The Apostolical Constitutions say: "Let the deacon overlook and superintend the people, that no one talk, or sleep, or laugh, but give ear to the word of God."

Before the appointment of the inferior orders, the deacons were employed in all those offices connected with the service of the church which were afterwards discharged by sub-deacons, exorcists, catechists, &c.

They were also the bishop's sub-almoners, and it was their duty to inquire into the necessities and wants of those who had any title to be taken care of by the Church.

They were likewise to take notice of the conduct of the people, rectify such irregularities as they could; and give information of weightier matters to the bishop. Hence they are frequently called in the old writers the bishop's angels, and prophets, his eyes, hands, mouth, &c.

§ 39. *Number of Deacons.*

The number of deacons varied according to the necessities of particular churches. In many churches, however, the number of seven seems to have been much insisted on, in imitation of the first church at Jerusalem. It was requisite that a person should be twenty-five years of age in order to be a deacon.

§ 40. *Respect paid and received.*

The deacons were obliged to great deference and respect to the presbyters as well as to the bishops. The Apostolical Constitutions respresent the bishop as sitting in the church on the middle and highest throne, and the presbyters sitting on the second thrones on each side of him, and the deacons *standing* by them.[1] The council of Nice expressly forbids deacons to sit among the presbyters in the

[1] Const. Apost. lib. II. c. 57.

church:[1] and some canons go so far as to forbid them to sit in the presence of a presbyter any where, except by his permission.[2] Nor was a deacon to say grace at a common feast in the presence of a presbyter, without their direction.[3]

But on the other hand, the inferior clergy and the people were obliged to pay great respect to the deacons. It is ordered in the canons of various councils, that the deacons shall be treated by the people with the same deference, as the former pay to their superiors.

CHAPTER SIXTH.

OF ARCHDEACONS AND DEACONESSES.

§ 41. *Archdeacons.*

Archdeacons were anciently of the order of deacons, and were advanced to this peculiar office by the appointment of the bishop, and not by any rule of seniority; though by some canons the bishop is directed ordinarily to choose the senior deacon, if he be duly qualified. From the nature of the archdeacon's office, it was a place of great interest and influence; and the holder of it was commonly chosen the bishop's successor.

The duties of this office rendered him the immediate assistant of the bishop, particularly at the altar, so that, in Jerome's language, "he was always at the bishop's side." He proclaimed at the commencement of the communion service: "let no one approach in wrath; let no one come in hypocrisy." He administered the cup to the people, when the bishop celebrated the communion. Under the direction of the bishop he regulated all things pertaining to the service of the church, as what deacon should read the Gospel—what one "bid the prayers"; and he assigned the various offices to be performed for the time by the inferior clergy, &c.

He also assisted the bishop in managing the revenues of the church, or as his substitute, had the chief care of the widows, orphans, &c.

---

[1] Conc. Nic. Can. 18. [2] Conc. Laod. c. 20. Carth. 4. c. 39. [3] Hieron. Ep. 85. ad Evagr.

He was most commonly selected by the bishop to assist him in preaching, also in ordaining the inferior orders, which was not done by imposition of hands, but by delivering certain symbols of their respective offices. To give an instance from the canons of the fourth council of Carthage in relation to the ordination of an acolythist: "the bishop was to inform him what his duty was; and then the archdeacon was to give him a taper in his hand, that he might know he was appointed to light the candles of the church."

He had authority to censure the other deacons and also the inferior clergy, but not the presbyters.

In regard to his jurisdiction, there is some dispute, whether it was confined to the city-church, or extended over the whole of the bishop's diocese—concerning which it is difficult to decide. The rise of this office is also involved in obscurity. No mention of it is made by Cyprian in the third century; though Jerome in the fourth says "that it was then *the custom* to have one bishop, one arch-presbyter, and one archdeacon to every church.[1] And before the end of the third century, Cæcilian is supposed to have had the title and office of archdeacon of Carthage, in fact he is so called by Optatus. Augustine indeed considers Stephen to have been the first archdeacon; but it may have been only a primacy of dignity and respect, not of jurisdiction.[2]

§ 42. *Deaconesses.*

Before dismissing this part of the subject notice may be taken of the deaconesses, whose office and service seems to have been of much use in the primitive Church. St. Paul speaks of Phœbe as "a servant (διάκονος *diaconissa*) of the church of Cenchrea;" Rom. xvi. 1. They were sometimes called *viduæ*, widows, and *elderly widows* (πρεσβύτιδες); because such were commonly chosen. Indeed some ancient laws required that they should be widows who were of considerable age, had been the wife of but one man, and had borne children. The Apostolic Constitutions say the "deaconess must either be a chaste virgin or a widow that had been the wife of one man."

As to the consecration or ordination of deaconesses there is some differences of opinion, some affirming and others denying that it was

[1] Hieron. Ep. 4. ad Rustic. [2] Aug. Serm. I. de Sanctis.

done by the imposition of hands. But the council of Nice in one of its canons distinguishes between such as had and such as had not been thus ordained, saying those "who assume the habit or dignity of this office, never having had any imposition of hands, are to be reckoned only among the laity."[1] The language of other councils and writers shows the imposition of hands to have been the practice of the Church, and removes all doubt from the interpretation of the canon of Nice.

§ 43. *Offices and duties.*

Yet this mode of consecration gave them no *sacerdotal* power. Women were expressly forbidden the exercise of the sacred functions of the clergy: and it was made one of the special charges against the Heretics and Schismatics that they allowed women to preach and perform other functions of the ministry. Thus Epiphanius says, "there is indeed an order of deaconesses in the Church, but their business is not to administer the sacraments, nor to perform any part of the sacerdotal office, but only to be a decent help to the female sex at the time of their baptism, sickness, affliction, or the like."[2] And it appears that these duties were confined to certain inferior offices chiefly relating to the women—for whose sake they were ordained. Thus they assisted in preparing them for baptism, so that the ceremony might be decently performed. They also had some charge as private catechists of those women who were candidates for baptism;—also in visiting women who were sick, or in distress, or in cases, where the deacons could not do so, on account of scandal.

In times of danger and persecution they were also employed to minister to the confessors and martyrs in prison, because they could do it with less suspicion and danger than the men.

They also assigned to the women their places in church—observed and regulated their behaviour—and had the special charge and oversight of the rest of the widows of the church.

§ 44. *How long it existed.*

How long this order continued is not precisely known. It was not probably laid aside all at once. In general it continued longer in the Greek than in the Latin church. There were decrees

[1] Conc. Nic. c. 19. [2] Epiphan. Haer. 59.

against further consecrations, in the Western church in the fifth century; but it is not until the tenth or eleventh century that all traces of them become extinct. In the writers of the middle age, it is to be observed the word *diaconissa* is met with as signifying simply a deacon's wife; just as *Episcopa* and *Presbytera* mean respectively the wife of a bishop and of a priest; referring to the wives they had before they were admitted to sacred orders.

CHAPTER SEVENTH.

OF THE INFERIOR ORDERS OF CLERGY IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

§ 45. *Number, origin, and general purpose.*

We come now to speak of what were commonly called inferior orders of clergy. The Romish authorities make the number to be precisely five, namely, sub-deacons, acolythists, exorcists, readers, and door-keepers—and assert that they were of apostolical institution. Yet the testimonies alleged in support of their apostolical origin are of no weight; and it is generally admitted by the best writers that they can be traced no higher than the third century. In the most ancient writers no mention is made of them, and after they begin to be spoken of, the accounts differ as to the number of them. There can be no doubt therefore that they were only of ecclesiastical origin—that they were not instituted in all the churches at the same time, but arose gradually,—some of them being received earlier than others.

The purpose of their institution was in general to assist the deacons in some parts of their services; and also to serve as a sort of nursery for the superior orders. Hence they were restricted to the perpetual service of the Church, and not allowed to return again to a secular life.

Yet they differed from the superior orders in several important respects. They were called *insecrati*, *unconsecrated*, while the three superior orders were called ἱερωμένοι, *holy and sacred*. The superior orders were always ordained at the altar and by imposition of hands; those commonly not so. But the chief difference was in the nature of their office and functions. The superior order were

ordiained to minister before God, as priests, to celebrate or assist at the sacraments, and to preach in the church ; but the inferior orders were only to attend on the others, and to perform such inferior offices as any Christian by the bishop's appointment might perform.

§ 46.—1. *Sub-deacons.*

The first mention made of these is in the third century, when Cyprian often speaks of them. Their office as described in the canons of the fourth council of Carthage was "to fit and prepare the sacred vessels of the altar and deliver them to the deacon when wanted for divine service."[1] But they were forbidden[2] to come within the rails of the altar, or to seem in any way to act as deacons or ministers to the people at the altar. They were also to attend at the doors and conduct the people to their seats. They were also employed abroad as the bishop's messengers, in carrying letters to foreign churches, &c.

They were carefully restricted from encroaching on the office of the deacons ;—they were not to "bid the people to prayers," nor do any part of those offices which the deacons did as "holy criers," in indicating and prefacing the different parts of the service by set and solemn forms of words ; nor to wear the *horarium* or habit in which the deacons performed these services ; nor to sit in the presence of deacons without leave.[3]

§ 47.—2. *Acolythists.*

Cyprian mentions these in the third century ; but they did not exist for more than four hundred years in the Greek church. The fourth council of Carthage[4] describes their mode of institution ; from which it appears that their office consisted principally in lighting the candles of the church, and in attending the ministers with wine for the eucharist. The office required no imposition of hands, but only the bishop's designation and appointment.

§ 48.—3. *Exorcists.*

This office was grounded upon the belief of the Church in demoniacal possession, and in the power of casting out evil spirits in the name of Christ. In the apostolical and next age, it was believed this

---

[1] Conc. Carth. 4. c. 5. [2] Conc. Laod. can. 21. [3] Conc. Laod. c. 20.
[4] Conc. Carth. 4. can. 6.

power of expelling demons, was a miraculous gift of the Holy Ghost, not confined to the clergy, nor to any particular class of Christians.[1] During the three first centuries, the bishops and presbyters were, however, the usual exorcists for the Church;—but towards the latter end of the third century, and as is supposed by some,[2] upon the withdrawing of this general communication of miraculous power, there came to be a particular order devoted to this office. The council of Antioch A. D. 341, gives leave to the chorepiscopi to promote subdeacons, readers, and exorcists—which shows the latter to have been at that time a standing order in the Church. From this time they are frequently mentioned by the councils and other documents of the Church.

They were appointed to the office without imposition of hands, receiving from the bishop a book wherein were written the forms of exorcising, together with this charge: "receive thou these, and commit them to memory, and have thou power to lay hands upon the *energumens*, whether they be baptized or catechumens.[3]

§ 49. *Of the Energumens in reference to whom the office of Exorcist was instituted.*

Great and solemn emphasis seems to have been laid, in the feelings of the early Christians, upon the scriptural intimations concerning the existence of Evil Spirits and the fearful agency they were permitted, in the inscrutable system of human probation, to exert, and of the mysterious struggles which every Christian was to carry on with these "powers of darkness." All this is still recognized in the prayers by which the Church now prays to be delivered from the "crafts and assaults of the devil," and in similar forms of expression.

But besides this, there was a class of affections attributed to the special and peculiar agency of evil spirits. Persons thus affected were called *Energumens*, Ἐνεργούμενοι, which word, though in its largest sense signifying persons under the influence of any spirit, is used by Church writers to denote *those whose bodies are seized and possessed by an evil spirit.*[4]

---

[1] Origen, contr. Cels. lib. 7. p. 334.—Socrat. lib. 4. c. 27.—Tertull. Apol. c. 23. [2] Bona, Rer. Liturg. lib. 1. cap. 25. [3] Conc. Carth. 4. c. 7. [4] They were also called Δαιμονιζομένοι, *demoniacs*, Κατεχόμενοι, *possessed*;—and from the convulsions and contortions accompanying such afflictions, Χειμαζόμενοι, *Hyemantes*, i. e. *tossed by a winter tempest*, &c.

In reference to these the office of Exorcist was instituted. Besides the public prayers of the Church, such persons received special attention from the exorcists, whose duty it was to visit them, pray over them, take charge of their support while they were under the care of the Church, &c. &c.

§ 50.—4. *Readers.*

The first writer who makes mention of readers as a distinct order in the Church is Tertullian,[1] and there is no proof that they were instituted before the third century. Before that time the public reading of the Scriptures was performed by the deacons, and by presbyters, and bishops; and possibly, though there is no positive proof, it may have been done by laymen, by the bishop's particular direction.[2]

After the office was instituted, readers were generally reputed among the orders of the clergy, except perhaps at Alexandria. They were sometimes ordained by imposition of hands; but this was not the general practice. This station was a pulpit or reading-desk, not in the sanctuary or near the altar, but in the body of the church.[3] From thence they read the lessons and Gospels—except where the Gospels formed a part of the communion service read at the altar, which was done by the deacons.

Readers were ordained from among youth of a very early age,—because it frequently happened that parents dedicated their children to the service of the Church from infancy,—and they were trained in the inferior orders for the higher. But at length it was forbidden to make them readers till they were eighteen years old.

§ 51.—5. *Ostiarii, or Doorkeepers.*

This is the last of those orders held by the Romish church to be of apostolical institution. But no mention of them is made by Cyprian and Tertullian, nor by any writer but Cornelius,[4] during the three first centuries. In the Greek church the order was laid aside A. D. 692. So far as can be gathered, their office seems to have

---

[1] Tertull. de Præser. c. 41.—Cypr. Ep. 24 or 29. [2] Basnage, in Baron. p. 623.—Socrat. lib. 5. c. 22. [3] Hence in Cyprian, "*super pulpitum imponi*," "in pulpitum venire," denote the ordination of a reader. Ep. 34 or 39. [4] Ap. Euseb. vi. 43.

been the opening and shutting the doors of the church under the direction of the deacons and sub-deacons—giving notice of church assemblies, in times of persecution by private signals,—and in performing several services belonging to modern sextons.

CHAPTER EIGHTH.

OTHER ORDERS RECKONED AMONG THE INFERIOR CLERGY.

§ 52. *Psalmistæ, or Singers.*

But besides these five singled out by the Romish church, there are other orders that seem to have been as ancient and to have as good a title to be reckoned clerical. Among these are the *Psalmistæ*. They are first mentioned by the council of Laodicea, and the Apostolical Constitutions, and seem to have been instituted near the close of the third or beginning of the fourth century. The object of their institution was to retrieve and preserve the ancient Psalmody of the Church. They were called *canonical singers* (Κανονικοὶ ψαλταὶ) as their names were entered in the canon or catalogue of the clergy. In some places they alone were for a time allowed to sing —until the rest of the congregation could learn and join with them; and in general they acted as precentors or leaders, and hence were called *monitors* or *suggesters* (ὑποβολεῖς). Sometimes they sang alternate strains, the responses being sung by the congregation. They were appointed with a certain form and charge; but without imposition of hands; and could be ordained by a presbyter.[1]

§ 53. *Copiatæ, or Fossarii.*

This order was first instituted in the time of Constantine. Their office was to take care of funerals and the christian interment of the dead. They are sometimes called *Laborantes* and sometimes *Lecticarii*. Jerome expressly reckons them as among the *clerici*.[2] In Constantinople they formed a sort ot corporation, or collegium, and were called *collegiati* and *decani*, or deans.—It was their duty to see that all persons had a decent funeral; and particularly to perform

[1] Conc. Carth. 4. c. 10. [2] Hieron. Ep. ad Innocent.

this office for the poor, without exacting any thing from their relatives. Certain revenues were set apart to defray these expenses.

§ 54. *Parabolani.*

This is another order of men reckoned by some among the inferior *clerici*. Their office was to attend upon the sick and take care of them especially in cases of infections and contagious diseases. Hence they were called *Parabolani*, from their boldness in exposing themselves in these dangerous offices.—In Alexandria they constituted a sort of society, to the number of six hundred under the direction of the bishop, being chosen by him.

CHAPTER NINTH.

OFFICES NOT CONSTITUTING DISTINCT ORDERS, BUT PERFORMED BY THE OTHER ORDERS.

§ 55. *Catechists.*

The duty of this office was to instruct the Catechumens in the elements of religion and prepare them for baptism. It was sometimes performed by the bishop—sometimes by presbyters and deacons. It was not however confined to the superior clergy, the inferior orders being frequently appointed to the office. Thus Optatus, a reader, was made a catechist, by Cyprian—who calls him *doctor Audientium*, master of the hearers, or lowest class of catechumens.

They are sometimes called *Nautologi* in allusion to those whose office it was to receive passengers into a ship, explain the conditions, and take the fare; because they explained and taught the elementary conditions of Christianity and of admission to the Church.

§ 56. *Defensores.*

Besides the above, there were some other offices, commonly discharged by the clergy, not instituted however until the fourth and fifth centuries; which it may be worth the while briefly to notice. Among these is that of *Defensors of the poor*, a sort of advocates or patrons, whose duty it was to defend the poor against oppression; see them righted, &c. Also, *Defensores Ecclesiæ*, to solicit the

cause of a church or of an ecclesiastic, and endeavour to procure redress of grievance or wrong. This office was frequently discharged by laymen. In the Greek church and by Greek writers, they are called Ἔκδικοι and Ἐκκλησιέκδικοι, words of the same import as defensors.

§ 57. *Œconomi.*

Another of these later offices was that of *Œconomi*, or stewards of the Church, whose duty it was to take care of the revenues of the Church, and especially in vacant bishoprics. They were always chosen out of the clergy, whose consent was requisite to their appointment.

§ 58. *Some other inferior officers.*

Besides the above named there are the names of a few other officers occasionally met with in the writings of the fourth and fifth centuries; whose duties seem to resemble those of some of the officers already described.

One of these is *Mansionarii*, (παραμονάριοι,) by some spoken of as having the charge of lighting the candles of the church, by others as door-keepers; but by most modern critics as having a distinct charge, that of bailiff or steward of the *church lands.*

We find mention also made of *Custodes Ecclesiarum*, who seem to have been either the same as the *Ostiarii*, door-keepers, or as the *Seniores Ecclesiæ*, with duties like those of modern wardens and vestrymen.

The *Custodes Locorum Sanctorum* were residents and guardians of places in Palestine, accounted peculiarly sacred, as Golgotha, Calvary, &c.

The *Scuophylaces* (also Κειμηλίων Φύλακες) were keepers of the sacred vessels, treasures, archives, rolls and other precious things, laid up in the sacred repositories of the Church.

The *Hermeneutæ*, or *interpreters*, had, as Ephiphanius says "the office of rendering one language into another as there was occasion, both in reading the Scriptures and the homilies that were made to the people."

The *Notarii* (among the Greeks called ταχυγράφοι, quick or *short hand writers*) had the duty in the earlier times of persecution of taking notes of the trials of confessors and martyrs, their acts and say-

ings: at a later period they were employed in writing the acts of councils and proceedings of synods, drawing and reciting the instruments, &c., presented at those assemblies. They also took down the discourses of famous preachers.

The *Apocrisarii* or *Responsales*, seem to have been instituted in the time of Constantine. They resided in the imperial city in the quality of agents of foreign churches, or bishops, whom they represented.

BOOK SECOND.

CHAPTER FIRST.

ELECTIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS OF THE CLERGY.

§ 59. *Primitive modes of designating men to the ministry.*

In the apostolical and primitive times there were four modes by which persons were designated to the sacred ministry. 1. By *lot*, as in the case of Matthias, Acts, i. 23. This mode though not common was yet sometimes practised, as appears from a canon of the council of Barcelona, which directs this method of filling vacant bishoprics.[1] 2. Taking the first fruits of the Gentile converts. 3. The particular direction of the Holy Spirit. Thus Clemens Alexandrinus declares that John ordained such ministers for the Asiatic churches "as were pointed out to him by the Holy Ghost."[2] So Eusebius, says Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, was chosen "by *revelation* κατ'ἀποκαλυψιν—by an oracular voice."[3] Numerous instances of a like kind are recorded. 4. The last method was that of election, which, especially after the apostolical times, became the general practice. It is agreed on all hands that these elections were managed, with great caution and care: but there is less unanimity in regard to the particular manner of conducting them.

§ 60. *Different opinions respecting the people's power in electing the clergy.*

Some writers assert that the people never had any power or concern in choosing the clergy, save that of giving their testimonials, or offering their objections in case they had any reasonable grounds of objection.[4] Others say the people were the absolute and proper elec-

---

[1] Conc. Barc. Can. 3. [2] Clem. Alex. ap. Euseb. l. iii. c. 23. [3] Euseb. l. vi. c. 11. [4] Habert. Archier. p. 436. Bellarm. de Clericis, l. i. c. 7.

tors, and that by apostolical constitution;[1] though this last point, is not asserted by all.[2] Others assert that the people had as much right as any of the clergy below bishops, but that their suffrage was that of consent or concurrence.

Others again distinguish between the first and the later ages of the Church, asserting that the power of the people was greater in the times preceding the council of Nice than afterwards. Others still, distinguish between the election of bishops and of the other clergy, and say the people's consent was only required in the election of bishops.

§ 61. *Power of the people in the elections of bishops the same as that of the inferior clergy.*

Unquestionably the practice of the Church varied in different times and places. But in electing a bishop it appears that the people had the same power as was enjoyed by the inferior clergy: and that this power was not merely that of testimony and consent, but of real election. Thus Cyprian says of Cornelius that "he was made bishop by the testimony of the clergy and the suffrage of the people."[3] So Socrates says of Chrysostom, that "he was chosen by the common vote of all both clergy and people."[4] Cyprian declares that to be "a just legitimate ordination which is examined by the suffrage and judgment of all, both clergy and people."[5] Similar testimonies abound.

This is confirmed by several rules and customs of the Church; as that no bishop was to be obtruded upon an orthodox people without their consent; that the bishops were not unfrequently overruled, or yielded to the views of the people; and by the mode of the people's voting, which was sometimes, vivâ voce, by the acclamation "he is worthy," or, "he is unworthy," sometimes by subscribing a decree of election—which was presented to the metropolitan and provincial synod, in order to his consecration. In the Latin church, the *interventors* had the charge of procuring and presenting such votes and instruments. The concern of the people in electing bishops is also illustrated from the case of such as were made so by popular zeal and violence, against their own wishes; as for example Ambrose, bishop of Milan.

[1] Blondel, Apol. 379. [2] Mason. Consecr. of Bishops. l. 4. c. 4. Andrews, Resp. ad Bellar. c. 13. Spalatensis, de Repub. III. c. 3. [3] Cypr. Ep. 52 al. 55 ad Anton. [4] Socrat. lib. vi. c. 2. [5] Cypr. Ep. 68, al 67, ad Frat. Hisp.

It seems probable however, that in general the metropolitans and the clergy in the provincial synods, took the initiative steps, and that the metropolitan had in some sort the ultimate decision—though the feelings of the people were not disregarded.

§ 62. *Election of Presbyters.*

The same things appear generally to hold true in regard to the choice of *presbyters*. Thus Jerome says "that the presbyters and other clergy were as much chosen by the people as the bishops were."[1] Possidius notes this as the custom of the Church.[2] Augustine was brought before the bishop by the people, who required his ordination as presbyter, against his wishes and consent. Similar instances are frequent.

§ 63. *No change made by the Council of Nice.*

The Council of Nice seems in general to have settled and declared the ancient customs of the Church rather than to have made alterations. In regard to the matter in question there is indeed this canon: "that the presence, or at least the consent of all the provincial bishops, and the ratification of the metropolitan shall be necessary to the election and ordination of a bishop,"[3] yet this does not necessarily exclude the people from their right of voting: but was only intended to express the co-ordinate rights of the clergy and people, and particularly to prevent certain schismatical proceedings. This is confirmed by the fact that Athanasius was made bishop shortly after this council; and when the objection to him was raised that he was not the choice of the people, the synod in their synodical epistle, solemnly declared the contrary.[4] And Gregory Nazianzen declares of him that he was brought to the throne of St. Mark by the suffrage of all the people."[5]

The whole practice of the Church seems to be comprised in the two following canons of the fourth council of Carthage. The one decrees "that the ordination of a bishop should always be by the consent of four parties, the clergy, the laity, the provincial bishops, and the metropolitan, whose presence or authority was principally

---

[1] Hieron. Ep. 4. ad Rustic. [2] Possid. Vit. August. c. 21. [3] Conc. Nic. Can. 4. [4] Ep. Synod. Con. Alex. ap. Athan. Apol. II. tom. 2. p. 726. [5] Naz. Orat. 21. tom. 1. p. 337.

necessary in all such cases." The other declares: "that no bishop shall ordain any clergyman without consulting with his clergy, and asking the consent, approbation and testimony of his people." [1]

§ 64. *Exceptions to the general rule.*

There were some cases in which the suffrage of the people was not consulted; as when the majority became heretical or schismatical. Thus during the prevalence of the Arian heresy, and Donatist schism, the Church ordained orthodox bishops—who were required under heavy pains to repair to the churches assigned to them, and who if rejected by the people, were still accounted and honoured by the Church as bishops.[2] They were called "vacant bishops." Another exception was in relation to bishops ordained for remote and barbarous places; who were a sort of missionary bishops.[3] Again, in case any *interventor* or visitor, sent to promote a speedy election in a vacant bishopric, made interest to get possession for himself, he was not recognised by the Church, although the people might have chosen him.[4]—"Vacant bishops," moreover were not permitted to intrude into vacant sees without the consent of the metropolitan.[5]—Again, when the people were divided into parties and unable to agree upon a candidate, the metropolitan and synod interposed and chose a person whom neither party had named.[6]—After religion became established and protected by the State, the emperors sometimes took the power of nominating, in cases of division among the people.—Sometimes the bishops in council nominated two or three out of whom the clergy and people were to choose. This practice is settled in the council of Arles.[7] The Spanish Church established a different rule; the clergy and the people were to nominate three, and the metropolitan and provincial bishops were to decide by lot which of the three should be ordained." [8]

At a later period, as we find by the laws of Justinian, the power of electing was confined to the clergy and to the *optimates*, the gentry and persons of quality and condition—the common people being excluded. In this way things went on gradually, until at length the

---

[1] Conc. Carth. IV. c. 1. Ibid. Can. 22. [2] Collat. Carth. I. c. 182 [3] Ruffin. lib. 1. cap. 9. Socrat. 1. c. 19. [4] Conc. Carth. V. c. 8. [5] Conc. Antioch. c. 16. [6] Sidon. Apoll. lib. IV. Ep. 25. [7] Conc. Arelat. II. Can. 54. [8] Con. Barc. Can. 3.

power of electing, or at least of nominating, became almost wholly absorbed by princes and great personages.

§ 65. *Examinations and qualifications of the Clergy.*

Before a person could be regularly ordained, it was required that satisfactory evidence should be had of his *learning and soundness in the faith*. This was sought for from the testimony of the electors, from his answers to questions proposed, and from his subscribing a body of articles. His *moral character* was also strictly inquired into. Hence says Cyprian "the law is to choose bishops in the presence of the people who have a perfect knowledge of every man's life, &c."[1] On this account it was a rule not to ordain one from a foreign church;—nor any one who had done penance for a scandalous crime;—nor those who had been guilty, *after baptism*, of great crimes, as murder, adultery, &c;—nor those who had lapsed during persecution;—nor those who had been convicted of usury, treason, or sedition;—nor those who had mutilated their own bodies.

Usually too, any great irregularity in the baptism of a person (as clinic and heretical baptism) precluded his admission to holy orders. It was a rule too that none should be admitted, at least to the superior order of bishops, unless his whole family were converted to Christianity. Great care, finally, was taken to prevent simony or any other indirect or sinister arts to obtain election or ordination; and in many cases the party was obliged to make solemn oath that he had not used any such means.[2]

§ 66. *Rules in relation to the outward condition of such as were to be ordained.*

These rules prohibited the ordination to the sacred office of such as held any military or civil employments. The canons of the Church seem likewise to prohibit the ordination of such as had at any past time been soldiers. The first council of Toledo forbids such to be ordained deacons, even though they had never been actually concerned in shedding blood.[3]

No slave or freedman could be admited to orders without the con-

[1] Cypr. Ep. 68. al. 67. [2] See on this section the Apostolical Constitutions, Canons of the council of Nice, and of other early councils. [3] Conc. Tolet. I. c. 8.

sent of his master or patron;[1]—no member of a civil company tied to the service of the State, particularly none of the *Curiales* and *Decuriones*, that is, municipal officers under the Roman government; nor actors, stage-players, &c.

§ 67. *Digamy and Celibacy.*

In regard to *digamy*, it was an apostolical rule, "that a bishop or a deacon should be one who was the husband of one wife only." All the ancient laws of the Church were founded upon this rule; but there was a difference of opinion and practice in the interpretation of it. It was a very prevailing opinion that by it all persons were precluded from sacred orders who, *after baptism*, had been even legally married to two wives *in succession*.[2] Others thought it made no difference whether either or both of the wives had been married after baptism or before it,—but that in either case such persons were precluded from orders.[3] But the more probable interpretation was that which supposed the apostle to have prohibited the ordination of such as had several wives at once, or of such as had causelessly divorced their wives and married others.[4]

As to *celibacy*, there appears no ground in the early practice and canons of the Church for the Romish doctrine. It is generally agreed among the earliest writers that most of the apostles were married. In the next age we have innumerable accounts of married bishops and presbyters.[5] This indeed is admitted by the Romish writers; but they allege that such were married before their coming into sacred orders, and that upon their ordination they promised to live separate from their wives. This is mere conjecture, without any good evidence, and contradicted by many facts.[6]

There appears indeed a disposition in the third century to advance opinions unfavourable to the marriage of the clergy; but they were opposed in many quarters: nor does there appear to be any law or custom of the general Church against clerical marriage. At the council of Nice, a motion to prohibit the clergy from marrying, and oblige such as were married before ordination, to separate from their

---

[1] Canon. Apost. c. 82. [2] Tertull. de monag. c. 11. Hieron. Ep. 2. ad Nepot. [3] St. Ambros. de office. lib. 1. c. 50. [4] Chrysost. Hom. X. in 1. Tim. III. 2. Theodoret. in eundem loc. [5] Polycarp. Ep. ad Phillip.—Euseb. lib. VI. 42. Cypr. 35. al 40. &c. [6] Cypr. Ep. 52. al 49.

wives, was brought forward. But it was opposed and the motion quashed.[1] The other councils of that age, generally left the clergy free to follow their choice in this matter; though some of them began to enforce celibacy.

CHAPTER SECOND.

SOME RULES AND CUSTOMS IN REGARD TO THE ORDINATION OF THE PRIMITIVE CLERGY.

§ 68. *Canons to be read before Ordination.*

When a duly qualified person according to the foregoing rules had been chosen, it was the bishop's office (or, in case of a candidate for the bishopric, the metropolitan's,) to proceed to ordain him. Before doing this several other rules were however to be observed. Besides the oath against simony, and the subscriptions—which have been noticed, it was required that the canons of the Church should be read in the hearing of the candidate. Promise of obedience to them was at a later period required.

§ 69. *No one to be ordained without a fixed cure.*

It was the ancient custom of the Church and confirmed by the council of Chalcedon, "that no presbyter or deacon, or any other ecclesiastic should be ordained *at large*, (ἀπολελυμένως); but be assigned to some particular charge; otherwise his ordination would be null."[2] Exceptions to this rule were rare, and only in some peculiar and extraordinary cases.

§ 70. *Bishops not to ordain in the bishopric of another, nor persons belonging to another's jurisdiction.*

For the preservation of unity and order, no bishop might presume to ordain within the limits of another's diocese. So it is stated in the Apostolical Canons, and so decreed by the council of Antioch, and such appears to have been the universal rule of the Church.

---

[1] Socrat. lib. 1. c. 11. Sozom. lib. 1. c. 23. [2] Conc. Chaleed. can. 6.

Equally strict was the rule against a bishop ordaining a person from another's diocese, without the consent of the bishop from whence he came.[1]

§ 71. *Place and times of Ordination.*

No ordination could be regularly performed except in the church. The superior clergy however were alone ordained within the sanctuary, or altar part; the inferior without it.

It does not appear that during the first three centuries there was any rule or practice restricting ordinations to four particular periods of the year, or to any particular day of the week.

The ceremony was usually performed at the morning service and at the time of the oblation. This practice however related chiefly if not entirely to the ordinations of the superior clergy.

§ 72. *Ceremonies at Ordination.*

The ordination of the superior clergy was always given to the party kneeling at the altar, accompanied by prayer and *imposition of hands*, (χειροτονία, χειροθεσία) though these words do not always in themselves signify ordination.

The sign of the cross was sometimes used, but not anciently any ceremony of unction.

§ 73. *Forced Ordinations and Re-ordinations.*

The zealous violence of the people frequently in the early ages obliged persons to be ordained against their will: and nothing but a solemn protestation and oath that they would not be ordained could prevent it. This practice was afterwards prohibited; and those ordained against their consent might return to a secular life, except bishops, who were not allowed to relinquish their office.

All re-ordinations, where the ordination had been regular, were forbidden. But in regard to such as had been ordained by heretical or schismatical bishops, it was sometimes the practice to re-ordain them upon their coming into the bosom of the Catholic Church.

---

[1] Conc. Nice. can. 16. Sardis. can. 15. Arles, II. can. 13.

CHAPTER THIRD.

PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF THE PRIMITIVE CLERGY; THEIR MAINTENANCE AND REVENUES.

§ 74. *Respect mutually paid by the clergy to each other.*

Before speaking of the honour and respect accorded in the Church to the clergy on account of their sacred office, it is proper to notice the courtesy they owed to each other. In the first place, the duty of mutual hospitality was greatly insisted on. To neglect to offer it, or to refuse to receive it, was accounted a great offence. The clergy, in entertaining their brethren when travelling, were regarded as dispensing the hospitality of the Church; and it was done out of the revenues of the Church. Again, when visited by their brethren from abroad, it was a point of necessary courtesy to receive them with the honours due to their degree, and to request them to consecrate the eucharist when they were present at divine service. This was a very ancient custom, passed into a law by the council of Arles.[1] The fourth council of Carthage requires also that they be invited to preach.[2] Yet it is to be observed, that to ensure the performance of these courtesies, travelling clergy were required to take with them letters of communion and commendation. Thirdly, as a point of proper regard to their sacred office, the clergy were required to settle all differences among themselves, by the decision of their bishops and councils, without resorting to the civil tribunals. And finally, they were to exercise great caution in receiving or making charges against each other; and to scrutinize with great exactness the character of all witnesses against the clergy, and especially against a bishop.

§ 75. *Respect paid the Clergy by the State.*

From and after the time of Constantine, when Christianity became established in the State, many instances of respect were accorded to the clergy. The bishops were not to be compelled into a secular court to give testimony, but their evidence was taken in private. In

[1] Conc. Arelat. I. can. 20. [2] Conc. Carth. iv. can. 33.

such cases they were not required to make oath. Bishops and presbyters were exempted from examination by torture, to which other witnesses were liable. All the clergy were exempted from the ordinary cognizance of the secular courts in purely ecclesiastical causes; and also, as some think, in regard to the *levia delicta*, or lesser criminal causes; but not in greater criminal causes, nor in pecuniary causes with laymen.

Note. Most of the statements on these points, as well as those in the following sections, relate to the period from about the time of Theodosius, A. D. 380, or somewhat earlier, to that of Justinian, A. D. 530.

§ 76. *Exemption from certain taxes and offices.*

The ancient clergy did not claim as a matter of divine right any exemption from taxes. Yet by the favour of the emperors they were usually exempted from the personal or *capitation* tax; but not from taxes on their lands or possessions. Lands given to the Church were not exempted from the burthens resting upon them before such donation. The clergy were exempt from the charge of entertaining public functionaries and their retinues upon their journeys—also from the extraordinary taxes—and commonly from high-way taxes, and some other exactions.

They were also exempt from the necessity of serving the State in civil offices and employments.

§ 77. *Maintenance and revenues of the Clergy.*

The support of the clergy was provided for, first, by the oblations of the people. These church-offerings were either weekly, by the communicants when coming to the eucharist; or monthly,[1] by all persons able and willing to give. From this latter custom probably arose that of the monthly distribution among the clergy, of which Cyprian speaks.[2] The clergy also enjoyed certain revenues from lands and possessions given to the Church. These at first were small and precarious, from the continual persecutions to which the Church was subject during the three first centuries. Yet that the Church had such possessions, appears from the decrees of Maximinus, and afterwards of Constantine, ordering the restoration of such

[1] Tertull. Apol. c. 29. [2] Cypr. Ep. 34. al. 39.

possessions as the Church had been despoiled of during the persecutions. These revenues of the Church were greatly augmented by Constantine and his successors; who also made stated allowances out of the public exchequer.

Constantine also settled upon the Church the estates of martyrs and confessors who, during the persecutions, had perished without heirs. Theodosius, junior, assigned to the Church by law, the estates of intestate clergy dying without heirs. Heathen temples and their revenues were also sometimes given to the Church. In the fifth century the buildings and revenues of heretical conventicles were settled upon the Church.

It is to be observed that the early Church took great care to avoid scandal and just reproach, in regard to obtaining revenues. It was held unlawful to receive estates of which parents had disinherited their children in order to bestow them on the Church. The clergy were also forbidden to demand any thing for administering the sacraments and burying the dead. In point of fact the oblations of the people were anciently the most valuable part of the Church revenues.

As to *tithes* and *first-fruits*, it may be remarked that they were regarded as due to the Church of divine right, from the earliest times. From the Apostolical Canons, and from the Constitutions,[1] and likewise from still earlier writers, as Origen and Irenæus,[2] we learn that the custom and practice of making to the Church offerings of the *first-fruits*, existed from the apostolic age and was one source of the maintenance of the clergy. But for obvious reasons the payment of *tithes* could not well be exacted in the earliest age of the Church. It is generally thought that they were not put upon a settled footing until the fourth century.

§ 78. *Management and Distribution of Church Revenues.*

The revenues of the ancient Church were entirely in the hands and under the management of the bishop. To avoid suspicion, he was obliged to give an account of his administration of them to the provincial Synod, and also at his election to exhibit an inventory of his own personal estate.[3] The council of Chalcedon ordered that

---

[1] Con. Apost. can. 4. Constitut. Apost. lib. ii. c. 25. Selden Hist. Tithes c. 5. &c. [2] Origen contr. Cels. lib. viii. Iren. lib. iv. c. 32. [3] Conc. Antioch. c. 25. Canon. Apost. c. 39. al 40.

every bishop should have an *Economus*, or steward, to assist in the management of the revenues, to be chosen by the clergy.

At first the clergy were all attached to the *mother* or *cathedral church* of the city or diocese; serving the other churches and congregations indifferently; and receiving their share of the revenues from the common stock of the mother church. And when at a later period the clergy were fixed in particular parishes, the oblations of these parishes still went to the mother church, and were from thence distributed to the clergy. This was the practice at Constantinople as late as the middle of the fifth century.

In the most primitive times there were no particular rules in regard to the distribution: but every man received according to his need. Afterwards general rules were adopted. In the western church the income of the church was usually divided into three or four equal parts, of which one fell to the bishop, the second to the rest of the clergy, the third to the poor, and the fourth to the repairs, &c., of the church edifice. In some churches the division was into three equal parts, one for the bishop, one for the other clergy, and one for the edifice, lighting, &c. But in this case the support of the poor, and the dispensing of the hospitality of the church, fell upon the bishop. In Rome, in the time of Cornelius, there were fifteen hundred persons, besides the clergy, provided for by the Church. At Antioch, in the time of Chrysostom, above three thousand. In some churches, no division was made, but the bishop and the clergy all lived in common.

The practice of endowing particular churches and separating the maintenance of their ministers from the mother church, seems not to have arisen until the fifth century, nor to have become a general practice all at once.

It may be observed finally, that no alienations of Church property could be made by the bishop, but upon extraordinary emergencies and by the consent of the clergy, with the approbation of the metropolitan, or some of the provincial bishops.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

RULES RELATING TO THE LIFE AND CONVERSATION OF THE CLERGY.

§ 79. *Rules relating to their general character and deportment.*

The Church required in the clergy an exemplary purity and gravity beyond that of other men. They were to "draw the picture of all manner of virtues in their own lives, and set themselves as examples to the people."[1] "The priests' office is a more difficult province than that of leading an army or governing a kingdom, and requires an angelical virtue. His soul ought to be purer than the sun, that the Holy Spirit may never leave him desolate; but that he may be able always to say 'I live, yet not I, but Christ that liveth in me.'"[2]

The Church censures were also more severe against offending ministers than any others. The crimes of theft, perjury, fraud, sacrilege, adultery, and such like scandalous offences were punished with degradation from the ministry; also, lapsing in time of persecution, habitual drinking and gaming.[3] Taking usury, both that allowed, as well as that forbidden, to the laity by the laws, was also prohibited by an express canon of the council of Nice.[4]

The clergy were required to exercise the most exemplary hospitality to the poor and strangers, and in order to this, to observe great frugality and simplicity in regard to their own personal expenses. They were not to affect state, have rich furniture, nor give sumptuous entertainments.[5]

They were required to be patterns of meekness, humility and gravity; and the rules and canons of the Church were very strict against all unbecoming levity of deportment, all scurrility, buffoonery and indecency of discourse.

They were not only to be inoffensive in their speech and conduct, but to avoid as far as possible all suspicion, and to guard their name and reputation with the utmost solicitude, for the honour of the Church and glory of God. The care of the Church to secure the "good report" of the clergy may be seen, among multitudes of sim-

[1] Greg. Naz. Orat. i. Apol. tom. 1. p. 5. [2] Chrys. de Sarced. lib. vi. c. 2. [3] Conc. Arelat. i. c. 13. Can. Apost. 42. Conc. Eliber. 79. [4] Conc. Nic. c. 17. [5] Conc. Carth. 4. c. 15.

ilar instances, from the fact that the councils expressly enact that no "bishop, presbyter, or any other clergyman, shall visit widows and virgins alone, but in the company and presence of some other of the clergy, or some grave Christians."[1]

Still further to take away all ground of evil suspicion the great council of Nice forbids the clergy to have any women residing in their dwellings, save such, as from their degree of consanguinity, would expose them to no scandal.[2]

§ 80. *General Rules more especially relating to their official duties.*

Several things on this subject will better come up hereafter in speaking of the liturgy and service of the Church. The object now is to speak of some general obligations in regard to their official characters.

The first is, that by the laws and opinions of the Church, they were required to be devoted to a studious life, in order to acquire and preserve all the intellectual qualifications for their office. No plea was allowed as sufficient to exempt them from this duty. Their studies were to comprise in general every thing relating to the exposition and defence of the gospel; but particularly they were to study the Holy Scriptures, the canons, and approved writers of the Church. As to heathen, heretical, and other writings, they were to read them only for pious ends, and not to the neglect of sacred studies.

A constant attendance to the daily service and worship of the Church—wherever it was practicable to hold daily service—was required of them; and in the performance of public service they were to manifest the greatest gravity, solemnity, and reverence.

In preaching, it was much insisted on that their great aim should be the benefit and edification of their hearers; and to this end that they should choose a useful subject,—handle it with a clear, plain, and impressive style,—and with special application to the particular spiritual state and wants of the people.

They were to exercise great prudence and candour in regard to verbal differences of doctrine and unnecessary controversies—caring mainly about the unity of the Church; and yet on the other

[1] Conc. Carth. I. c. 3. iii. c. 25. Conc. Epaunens. c. 20. [2] Conc. Nice. can. 3.

hand, never compromising the essential truths of the gospel by a sinful indifference, but defending them with steadfast earnestness and courage at whatever hazard.

§ 81. *Exemplary Excellence of the Primitive Clergy.*

Such is the general idea of the life and character of a clergyman as required in the canons and documents of the ancient Church. And in general so truly did the clergy conform to this standard—so exemplary were they for sanctity, meekness, and devotion, that they compelled the admiration of the heathen and infidel enemies of Christianity. Thus we have the testimony of the emperor Julian, admitting the admirable excellence of their lives, and commanding the pagan high priest of Galatia to see to it that his priests copied so good a model.[1] The like admissions we have from the pen of Ammianus Marcellinus, and other heathen writers and enemies of Christianity;[2] while Christian writers, as Lactantius, Gregory, Nazianzen, Tertullian and Cyprian, boldly challenge their adversaries on this point, and draw such pictures of the holy and admirable lives of the primitive clergy, as might have been easily disproved if false. That there were exceptions, is plain from the admissions of these same writers, but it seems no less certain, that as a body, the early clergy were eminent for meekness, sanctity, zeal and devotion.

Note.—There are several ancient writings which illustrate this subject besides the acts and canons of synods. Of these may be mentioned Chrysostom's work *De Sacerdotio;* Jerome's Second Epistle to Nepotian, entitled *De Vita Clericorum;* Gregory Nazianzen's *Apology* for flying from the ministry. Also Chrysostom's *Life of Ignatius;* Gregory Nazianzen's *Life of Basil* and *Athanasius;* Possidius' *Life of Augustine.*—See also Seller's *remarks on the Primitive Fathers.*

§ 82. *Some rules intended as exterior safeguards of the clerical character.*

We have spoken of the rules relating to the life and conversation generally, and also of those relating more particularly to the official functions of the clergy. Something may be said of certain other rules intended as a security to the former.—One was, that the clergy were never to forsake their office and return to any secular calling. This was strictly insisted on in the African church. The council of

[1] Sozom. lib. V. c. 16. [2] Amm. Marcel. l. 27.

Chalcedon anathematizes ministers deserting their calling. So the council of Tours and others.[1] Yet there were exceptions, allowed not only in case of age and infirmity, but also cases where schism or disaffection rendered ministers useless, &c.

Another rule was that no clergyman should remove to another diocese without dimissory letters from his bishop; and the laws of the Church were very strict against the "rambling clergy" (*vancativi*) who went wandering about without such letters. Nor were bishops to be translated from one see to another without the approbation of the provincial synod.—The laws were very strict also in forbidding non-residence and pluralities.

Secular and civil offices were likewise prohibited under pain of degradation.[2] In some places the rules on this subject were so strict that the clergy could not undertake the duty of tutors or guardians, or be sureties. Nor could they engage in any trade, calling, or manual labor, except to provide for their maintenance where the revenues of the church were inadequate, or to serve certain plain ends of charity—in the employment of their leisure hours. They were also forbidden a too familiar intercourse with the Jewish and Gentile philosophers, the frequenting of taverns, theatres, &c.

As to the *garb and habit* of the clergy when not engaged in divine service there appears to have been no rules not reducible to the general direction, that it should be such as was decent and suitable, neither too nice on the one hand, nor sordid and slovenly on the other. All particular rules were influenced by the customs and taste of the times. Thus at a period when it was the custom of the gay, the worldly and fashionable, to wear long hair and shave their beards this was forbidden to the clergy.[3] And so in general whatever the customs of the times rendered grave and becoming was the standard for the ordinary garb of the clergy. Nor does it appear that there is any ground, in the practice of the primitive church, for the notions of the Romanists on the subject of tonsure and other peculiarities of clerical habit. The *birrus*, the *collubium*, the *dalmatica*, *caracalla*, *tunica*, and the *pallium*, are names of garments of different sorts and patterns worn in different places by the people generally, as well as by the clergy: and the only thing to be remarked is that the *pal-*

[1] Conc. Chalc. c. 7. Turon. c. 5. Cod. Just. lib. 1. lit. 3. [2] Can. Apost. c. 7. [3] Conc. Carth. 4. c. 44.

lium, or cloak, which was more affected as the philosophic garb, afterwards came to be the peculiar habit of the Christian Ascetics; and from this gradually became the most usual dress of the clergy.

CHAPTER FIFTH.

OF THE ASCETICS, VIRGINS AND WIDOWS.

§ 83. *Difference between the first Ascetics and the Monks of a later period.*

Some Romish writers have confounded the early *ascetics* with *monks*. But no traces of monastic life are met with till the middle of the third century. At this time, during the fury of the Decian persecution, many Christians of Egypt for safety and the quiet exercise of their religion, retreated to the neighbouring deserts and mountains. This mode of life was so agreeable that many continued it after the persecution ceased. But even then those Christians who had retired from the world were not formed into communities with rules and vows. The first monasteries were built and the first regular monastic societies were gathered by Pachomius, in Thebais, during the reign of Constantine. From thence the institution spread and the monkish system was gradually perfected.

As to the ASCETICS, they existed in the Church from the earliest times. The title was given to all Christians who devoted themselves to extraordinary exercises of piety and devotion. Hence the name ἀσκηταί. It was given to those who inured themselves to great degrees of fasting, and abstinence for mortification of sin. It was given also to such as devoted an extraordinary portion of time to prayer and devout exercises; to those who evinced superior contempt of the world, giving up their estates, and embracing a life of voluntary poverty and austerity; to widows, virgins, and those who abstained from marriage in order that they might exclusively devote themselves to prayer and holy contemplation.

It is to be remarked that the ascetics spoken of in the earliest times of the Church differed from the monks of a later period in three respects. 1. The monks were persons retired from the world; while the ascetics lived in the world and mixed with society and

affairs—only they were supposed to be more intent than others in the practices of devotion. 2. The monks at their first institution were laymen; but the ancient ascetics were of either class, clergy or laity. 3. The monks were gathered into communities under certain rules of discipline, which was not in any sort the case with the ascetics.

The ascetics are mentioned by Eusebius and Epiphanius[1] under the name of Σπουδαῖοι, *the fervent*, *the diligent*, from their eminent zeal in the exercises of piety, prayer, fasting, &c. Clemens Alexandrinus[2] calls them "the elect of the elect" (ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτοτεροι), as being the more choice part of Christian professors.

§ 84. *Virgins and Widows.*

A like distinction as that between ascetics and monks is to be remarked between the VIRGINS of the earliest times of the Church, and the *nuns* of a later period. The virgins were not gathered into communities or orders under particular rules of life and discipline. Nor, down to the time of Cyprian does their profession of celibacy appear to have been of the nature of a binding and perpetual vow. Greater strictness in this respect is observable in the succeeding age, and seems to have increased with the progress of monastic institutions and the respect entertained for them. The council of Ancyra, A. D. 314, declares against their ever marrying, and appoints the penance, &c.[3] Yet the marriage of such was never declared null. The professed virgins were usually consecrated in the church with some peculiar forms, and they usually had a distinguishing habit or dress. *Nonæ*, *moniales*, *ascetriæ*, and *sanctimoniales*, are common appellations for them in the ancient writers.

The WIDOWS of the early Church were in many respects of the same standing in the Church as the virgins, being generally under the same rules and laws as to habit, profession, and the like. They were employed in many pious and charitable offices connected with the Church. They were such as had lived with but one husband, and had remained for a considerable time unblamably in the state of widowhood, and professed a purpose of continuing so, for the more perfect service of God and the Church.

---

[1] Euseb. lib. vi. c. 11.—Epiphan. Expos. Fid. n. 22. [2] Clem. Alex. Homil. ap. Combefis. Auct. Nov. p. 18. [3] Conc. Ancyr. can. 19.

The virgins and widows of the Church had some peculiar privileges. Their persons were sacred,—they were enrolled in the canons of the churches,—they were respectfully distinguished by their place in the house of God,—and they were, if they needed, entitled to a share in the revenues of the Church.

BOOK THIRD.

CHAPTER FIRST.

OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH EDIFICES.

§ 85. *Names of Churches.*

The Greek word, ***Ecclesia***, in its primary meaning denoting a convocation or assembly of persons, is used by the ancient writers to signify not only the body of the faithful, but also the edifices in which they were wont to assemble for divine worship. By the Latin writers the names *Dominicum*, *Domus Dei*, *the Lord's house*, are used in the same sense. In Greek this is κυριακὸν, ***Kuriacum;*** and from hence, the Saxon and German *Kyrik* and *Kirche*, and the Scottish and English *Kirk and Church*.

There are some words found in the ancient writers that should not be confounded with these. The title *domus divina*, was used by the custom of the times to signify the *imperial palace* or *family*. The name *domus ecclesiæ*, *the house of the Church*, is used for the residence of the bishop or clergy attached to the Church.

Churches were also called *Oratories*, *Houses of prayer*, (προσευκτήρια, Οἶκοι Εὐκτήριοι); as in Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomon, and other ancient writers. Subsequently however the word came to denote private chapels.

In the fourth and fifth centuries churches came to be called ***Basilicæ***, (βασιλικὰ) *palaces of the great king*. During the three first ages churches were rarely called *temples*, as savouring too much of paganism; but after the abolition of idolatry, the name was freely given to them.

Synodi, *Concilia*, *Conventicula*, were also names applied to churches. *Martyria* or *Memoriæ*, were general titles of churches built over the graves of martyrs; *Apostoleia*, and *Propheteia*, of such as were built in honor of Apostles and Prophets. *Tituli* were parish churches in distinction from the *Ecclesia matrix*, the mother or diocesan church of a city. Several other less frequent and less noticeable names might be mentioned.

§ 86. *Origin of Churches.*

It has been said[1] that the Christians had no places consecrated and set apart for divine service during the three first ages. It is worth the while to adduce something of the evidence on this subject. It does not seem likely that during the early progress of Christianity, while its disciples were exposed to derision and persecution, their places of assembly and worship would bear any comparison with the structures of a later period. Nevertheless they would be likely as far as possible to have fixed places of assembling for divine worship. These, especially in times of danger, were very probably in the dwellings of private Christians and other secluded places. Yet there is no reason to suppose they were not consecrated to sacred purposes. Clemens Romanus says, "that God had ordained as well appropriate places where, as appropriate times and persons when and by whom, he would be solemnly served, that all things might be done religiously and in order."[2] Augustine, Basil, and other writers understand the passage of St. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 22, "Have ye not houses to eat in, that ye despise the Church of God," to refer not to the assembly, but to the place set apart for celebrating divine worship and the sacraments;[3] and from hence they infer that churches existed in the *first* century.

In the *second* century, we find Ignatius exhorting Christians to assemble in their place of worship, which he calls "the temple of God."[4] In another epistle he says, "there was one altar to every church, &c."[5] Clemens Alexandrinus speaks also of the *ecclesia* in the sense of the place where divine worship was held.[6]

In the *third* century the testimonies become abundant, in the frequent passages of writers who speak of the demolition of the churches during the persecuting times, and of their subsequent rebuilding; as Origin, and others.—Eusebius speaking of the peaceable times which Christians enjoyed from the persecution of Valerian to the time of Diocletian, says, "that the number of Christians so grew and multiplied in that fifty years, that their *ancient churches*

---

[1] Vedelius, Exercit. in Ignat. Ep. ad Ephes. c. 4. Suicer. Thesaur. Eccl. voce Naos. [2] Clem. Rom. Ep. 1. ad Cor. n. 40. [3] August. Quest. 57, in Levit. Basil, Regul. major. Qu. 30. Reg. Minor. Qu. 310. [4] Ignat. Ep. ad Magnes. n. 7. [5] Id. Ep. ad Philad. n. 4. [6] Clem. Alex. Strom. 7.

were not large enough to hold them, and therefore they erected from the foundations more ample and spacious ones in every city."[1]

§ 87. *Style and form of the ancient Churches.*

There seems to have been no uniform practice in regard to the position and form of the ancient churches. Some were oblong and of the figure of a ship; others circular; others octangular; others in the form of a cross; others rectangular at one end and semicircular at the other.

In order to give a clear idea of the ancient churches, perhaps we had better follow a particular description given by Eusebius,[2] of the church at Tyre built by Paulinus. The correspondence between this and other churches in the main features is sufficiently exact for the purpose.

In the strictest sense the church included only the building proper, divided into three parts by rails: 1. The *Narthex*, or *ante-temple;* 2. the *Naos*, or *temple;* 3. the *Bema*, or *sanctuary*.

In a larger sense it embraced also the *ambitus*, or *enclosing wall*, and every thing included by it, as an outer porch, an area with cloisters and porticoes around it, also porticoes on the outer side of the church proper, and several *exedræ* or outer buildings adjacent to the church proper. It is in this large sense that Eusebius takes it.

§ 88. *Exterior Narthex, or ante-temple.*

The first thing then to be noted is the enclosing *wall* (περιβολον). In front of this, (and in the particular church mentioned, looking towards the east) was a large and lofty porch (προπυλον μεγα)—*vestibulum magnum, the great vestibule*,) which gave entrance through the great wall to the area immediately in front of the church. This porch was also called the *first entrance* to distinguish it from the doors of the church proper, which were the second entrance.

Between the great porch and the body of the church was a large square area or court enclosed by a wall, with a projecting roof resting upon columns, and forming porticoes with colonades around the whole court. This area, as to the rest, was open to the sky, and hence called ἀιθριον, *atrium* and *impluvium;* also μεσαυλιον.—In the

[1] Euseb. lib. VIII. c. 1. [2] Euseb. lib. VIII. c. 1.

middle of the atrium, commonly was a fountain, for the people to wash their hands and faces before entering the church. This is called *Cantharus* and *Phiala*, and various other names of like import, by different writers. The use of the water in the early times was only a matter of cleanliness and a token of respect for the Church, and nothing like the Romish holy-water. The atrium was the place of the energumens, and of the mourners, a class of penitents or rather candidates for penance; and of all who were not allowed to go further within the church.

The *propyleum*, or great porch, and the *atrium* with its porticoes, made up the *exterior naxthex*, or *outer ante-temple*.

§ 89. *The church proper.*

From the atrium you passed through the porticoes which were built against the wall of the church proper, into the church. There were three inner porches and doors by which you entered the body of the church, of which the middle one was the largest. There were also porches and doors on each side of the church.

The body of the church was divided into *three parts*, separated by railings with gates. 1. The *first* part into which you entered from the atrium was the *narthex* (interior)—προναος, *ante-temple*, where some penitents and catechumens stood, with Jews and Gentiles.

2. From hence you passed by gates—called *beautiful* or *royal gates*—through the railing into the *second* part called the *naos*, the *temple* or *nave* of the church. In the lowest part of this was the place of certain penitents, called *substrati* (ὑποπιπτοντες) from the custom of prostrating themselves after the sermon to receive the bishop's benediction and to join in the prayers peculiarly offered for them, after which they were to depart before the communion service began.—Immediately beyond this place was the *Ambo*, or *reading-desk*, an elevated place ascended by steps, occupied by the readers, singers, and such of the clergy as ministered in the first service, or *missa catechumenorum*. It was not usual for the bishops or presbyters to preach from this place, but from the steps of the altar.

Beyond the *ambo* was the place of the communicants, and of the *consistentes*, or such penitents as were allowed to witness the communion service, though not to partake of the eucharist.

On each side of the nave were porticoes for the *men*, above which, supported by the pillars, were galleries (ὑπερῶα, *Hyperoa*,) for the *women*,—who were usually separated from the men. The inner part of these porticoes and galleries was sometimes divided into little cells for private meditation and prayer.

Particular places of respect were usually assigned to the virgins, widows, and aged women of the Church; sometimes also to magistrates and others.

The *third* and innermost part of the church was the *Bema*, answering to the chancel of modern churches. It was also called ἅγιον, ἱερατεῖον, *sacrarium*, *the holy*, or *sanctuary;* also θυσιαστήριον *the altar-part;* sometimes *chorus*, or *choir*. It was separated from the other part by rails, (κιγκλίδες, *cancelli*,) and kept inaccessible to all but the clergy; whence it was sometimes called *adyta*. It was frequently screened from the rest of the church by hangings or rails, which concealed the altar until the time of the oblation.

The upper end of the Bema or chancel was semicircular; hence called the *apsis* or *concha bematis*. Here, ranged in a semicircle against the wall and behind the altar, were the seats of the presbyters, with the bishop's throne in the middle.

§ 90. *The Altar.*

The communion table stood nearly in the middle of the chancel. The communion table was called the *Holy Table*, *the Lord's Table*, *Altar*, *&c.;* though the Christians denied that they had altars in the pagan or Jewish sense, that is, places for idol images, or for bloody sacrifices. Altars were commonly built of wood, until the time of Constantine.[1] There was anciently but one altar in a church.[2]

§ 91. *Ornaments and utensils of the Altar.*

In some churches there was an ornamented canopy overhanging the altar, usually called *ciborium*, but sometimes *umbraculum*, sometimes πύργος or *turret*, from its structure. At a later period a silver dove, as the symbol of the Holy Ghost, was represented hovering over the altar.

---

[1] August. Ep. 50. ad Bonif.—Optat. lib. vi. p. 94.—Hospin. de templis II. c. 6 Ignat. Ep. ad Philad. 4.—August. Hom. 3. in 1 Jo.

It is not easy to decide when the figure of the cross came to be set up as an ornament of the altar, or to be used in the churches. The best opinions fix the time as not till after the year 340.[1]

The altar was always covered with cloth of fine linen, or sometimes of more costly material. The vessels used in the celebration of the eucharist, the candlesticks, lamps, &c. were usually of gold or silver—unless in cases of extreme poverty, or for other special reasons. The use of censers and the practice of burning incense, and also of having lighted candles in the church in the day time, cannot be traced in the most ancient customs of the Church, but came in at a later period.

§ 92. *Prothesis and Lesser Diaconicum.*

Within the Bema or chancel, against the wall of the *apsis bematis*, on each hand of the altar, was a recess or closet. These recesses are sometimes spoken of together under the name of *Secretaria.*[2] One of them, usually that on the right hand of the altar, served as the place where the offerings of the people made at communion were placed, and from which the bread and wine were taken that were consecrated at the altar for the eucharist. Cyprian speaks of this place by the name of *Corban.*[3] The fourth council of Carthage calls it the *Sacrarium*,[4] distinguishing it from the *gazophylacium*, or *treasury*, without the church. In the later writers it is called Prothesis, *Paratorium*, *Oblationarium.*

The other recess or closet, on the left hand of the altar, was a sort of vestry, to which the deacons brought the vestments, vessels and utensils belonging to the altar, from the larger building (*Diaconicum*) out of the church, to have them in readiness for the communion service. It was hence called *Diaconicum Bematis*, and also *Scuophylacium*, because these utensils were brought back here immediately after service. Here the priests put on their robes, and here, after service, they came to make their private devotions.

§ 93. *The Baptistery, and other outer buildings of the church.*

There were various buildings distinct from the main edifice of the church, yet included within the wall, and reckoned a part of the

---

[1] Dalleus, de Cultu. Rel. lib. v. c. 8. [2] Paulinus, ep. 12. ad Sever. [3] Cypr. Oper. et Eleemos. p. 203. [4] Can. 93.

church in the larger sense of the word. These were comprised under the general name of *Exedræ*. Of these we may notice first the Baptistery, which is spoken of by several writers as a building by itself.[1]

These baptisteries were generally large and spacious, because baptisms being held only at stated times, multitudes were baptized at once, and the rite being performed by immersion, a large font was necessary. The baptisteries were indeed frequently so capacious that we sometimes read of councils being held in them.[2] Sometimes they were divided into an ante-room in which the profession of renunciation, &c. was made, and another room, in which the ceremony of baptism was performed.

These edifices were sometimes called φωτιστήρια, *places of illumination*, because the rite of baptism itself was anciently styled *illumination*, and the baptized *illuminati*. The baptisteries might also have had this name because of the illumination or instruction here given to the catechumens previous to baptism. The font was distinguished from the baptistery, by the names of *Piscina*, *Columbethra*, *Lavacrum*, *&c.*

It is the opinion of some that anciently there was but one baptistery in a city, and that at the bishop's or mother church; and that they resorted to this from the other churches at the festivals of Easter and Pentecost, which, were the two solemn times of baptism. At a later period baptisteries were set up in the country and other churches.

§ 94. *The Diaconicum magnum, or Vestry.*

This was another of the *exedræ* of the church. It was the place where the vestments, vessels, utensils and other things belonging to the service of the church, were kept under the care of the *deacons*, subject generally to the oversight of a presbyter, and from whence they were brought when wanted to the *lesser diaconicum* within the chancel of the church proper.

It was also called *Secretarium*, because the consistory or tribunal of the church was held here, the word being taken from the usage of civil courts. These buildings were so large that not only con-

[1] Paulin. Ep. 12. ad Lev.—Cyril. Catech. Myst. 1. n. 2.—Sidon. Apol. lib. iv. Ep. 15. [2] Du Fresne, Conc. Chalced. Act. 1.

sistories, but even provincial and general councils were sometimes held in them. The Diaconicum was likewise called *Receptorium*, and *Salutatorium* because the bishops and presbyters sat here to receive the salutations of the people who came for their blessing or to consult them. An inner part of the diaconicum seems to have been called *ceimeliarchium* and *scuophylacium*, as being the particular place for depositing the vessels, &c, of the church.

Decanica or *Decaneta*, places of confinement for delinquent clergymen and others;—*mutatorium*, place for changing robes, are names that appear also to have been given to this building, when used for the purposes indicated by the words.

§ 95. *Pastophoria, and other buildings.*

There were sometimes still other buildings included within the great wall. A variety of names are found in different writers in regard to the application of which there is some ambiguity. *Pastophoria* seems to indicate most appropriately the dwellings of the clergy, and of the *mansonarii*, or keepers of the church. *Gazophylacum* is the treasury, where the offerings of the people not brought to the altar and various other things belonging to the church, were kept.

There were also libraries and schools within the wall, either in distinct buildings, or in the baptistery and pastophoria. Within the enclosure were sometimes also baths, hospices or lodgings for strangers and poor, cloisters, porters' lodges, little gardens and walks. All these and every thing included within the wall, were, in a certain sense considered as a part of the church—particularly in reference to the right of sanctuary or protection.

§ 96. *Organs and bells not used in ancient Churches.*

No instrumental music was used in the ancient churches. Organs were not introduced into divine service till the thirteenth century. Bells were not used until about the eighth century. In the earliest times of the Church it was generally necessary that notice of assemblies for divine service should be privately given. At a later period, and before the introduction of bells, various signals were in use, such as trumpets, cries, beating with mallets upon wooden or iron plates, &c.

§ 97. *Anathemata or ornaments of the ancient Churches.*

The word *anathemata* was used to denote all the vessels of the Church, all ornaments and offerings, consecrated to the service and honour of God. It was sometimes particularly used to signify such gifts as had been made as memorials and symbols of pious gratitude and which were *suspended* to public view upon the pillars of the church. The churches were also adorned with portions of Scripture, and other pious inscriptions written upon the walls; the vessels and furniture of the church were sometimes adorned in like manner. Mosaic work and gilding were greatly employed in ornamenting the churches; but no pictures or images were allowed during the three first ages to be put up in the churches even for ornament. The council of Eliberis, A. D. 305, has an express canon forbidding it: "we decree that pictures ought not to be in churches lest that which is worshipped and adored be painted upon the walls."[1] An occasional mention of some symbol, as of a shepherd upon a communion cup[2] is found in the early writers; but pictures and images were not introduced into churches until near the end of the fourth century, and then it was very uncommon to find them. They were paintings of scripture subjects, and portraits of bishops and kings. But in no case were they designed for worship. Nor was any picture of God or the Trinity allowed in churches until after the *second* council of Nice; for this council declares itself against it.[3] And up to the time of the sixth general-council, A. D. 680, the representations of Christ or the Holy Ghost, were generally merely symbols, as a lamb or a dove.

The custom of ornamenting the churches with flowers and branches was prevalent as is noted and commended by Augustine and Jerome.[4]

§ 98. *Consecration of Churches.*

When the churches were finished and adorned, they were consecrated, or dedicated and set apart for divine service. The manner and ceremonial of this was not universally the same, nor is it easy

[1] Conc. Eliber. c. 36. [2] Tertul. de Pudict. c. 10. [3] Germ. Ep. ad Leon. Act. 4. Conc. Nic. 2. [4] Aug. de Civ. Dei. xxii. 8. Hieron. Ep. 3. Epitaph. Nepot.

to find any precise information on the subject earlier than the time of Constantine, when churches began to be consecrated with great solemnity. These ceremonies were rendered the more imposing by the presence of a whole synod of the neighbouring bishops. The services usually opened with a sermon or panegyrical oration, then followed the consecrating forms and prayers. It was against rule to use a church for divine service before it had been consecrated, except upon a great exigency.

The consecration was always performed by the bishops, and the bishop of the diocese was the ordinary minister on such occasions. No presbyter could consecrate a church.[1] No church could regularly be built without the bishop's permission; and generally he offered solemn prayer and performed other ceremonies similar to the modern laying of the corner stone, at the place where the church was to be built.[2] Finally, no bishop had the power, in ordinary circumstances, of consecrating a church out of his own diocese.

The ancient churches were dedicated solely to God, and not to saints. Thus Augustine uses it as an argument for the divinity of the Holy Ghost, that churches are dedicated to him, which it would be impious to do to any angel or creature.[3] And the ancients are very careful to distinguish between *naming* the churches in *memorial* or *honour* of saints and martyrs, and the *dedication* of them, which was to God alone.

§ 99. *Respect and Reverence paid to Churches.*

The ancient Christians held their churches in great reverence, using them only as houses of God, and allowing nothing to be done in them that had not some connection with religion and piety. They might be used for religious assemblies, for the election of bishops, for the sittings of councils, and for catechetic schools; but not for eating lodging or any of the ordinary uses of dwellings. Hence, when the *Agapaæ* or *feasts of charity*, which at first were held in the churches were found liable to abuse, they were forbidden to be had in the church.[4] The like respect was paid to all the sacred vessels and utensils belonging to the administration of divine service. It was deemed profanation to use them for any but sacred purposes; and

[1] Conc. Bracar. I. c. 37. [2] Conc. Chalc. can. 4. Justin. Novel. 131 c. 7
[3] August. contr. Maxim. lib. 1. tom. 6. p. 288. [4] Conc. Laod. c. 28.

to this end they were kept in the *scuophylacium*, and never removed from it, but for the service of the altar. The ancient Church severely condemned the views of such heretics as made light of the regular public service of consecrated churches, or taught that divine service might as well be celebrated in private houses. Some canons declare it to be the doctrine of the Catholic Church that the public offices of religion should be performed in the churches and not in private dwellings.[1]

There were several ceremonies and tokens of respect paid on entering the church and in it. Among these may be mentioned the custom of washing the hands and face at the fountain in the court, before entering the church; also that of putting off their shoes, which was a customary token of respect in the East; but it seems not to have been a general practice. The same may be said of the custom of bowing to the altar.

When kings and emperors and great officers of state went to church, they laid aside their crowns, guards, arms and other ensignia. It was a customary piece of respect also to embrace and salute the doors, pillars, and altar of the church. All were required to maintain a deportment of the greatest reverence and solemnity in the church. Besides the public services of the church, it was likewise allowable to give access to them to individuals for extraordinary acts of devotion, as vigils, and seasons of special religious meditation. As illustrating the reverence in which churches were held, as places of inviolable sanctity, it may be mentioned that they were regarded as the safest places of deposit for things of great value.

§ 100. *Churches as Asylums, or places of Refuge.*

The sacredness of churches is still further evinced from their being held as the safest refuge in times of peril, and from the laws and customs that grew out of this in regard to the privilege of sanctuary. Churches appear to have had this privilege from the time of Constantine, for the laws of Theodosius which are the first that expressly relate to it, A. D. 392, seem not to establish it, but only to explain and regulate what had existed before.

It is thought by some that at first the inner part of the church pro-

[1] Conc. Gangren. c. 5.

per, and particularly the altar, was the appropriate and peculiar place of refuge,—hence called ἄσυλος τράπεζα, *the table from which no one could be torn away.*[1] Whether or not this was originally so, the limits were afterwards greatly extended, so as to include the whole space within the outer wall. One reason of this extension was that the church proper might not be desecrated by becoming the eating and lodging place of those who taking refuge there might be obliged to continue for some time.

As to the persons who were allowed the privilege of sanctuary, it may be observed that this privilege was not intended to encourage evil doers or defraud the due execution of justice, but was designed for the innocent and oppressed, and for the cases of doubtful guilt until a fair trial could be had, and also to give an opportunity for the bishops to intercede in behalf of such criminals as it might be proper and becoming for them to interest themselves in procuring pardon for. Hence there were several sorts of persons expressly excepted from the privilege of sanctuary. These were fraudulent public defaulters—particularly Jews pretending to turn Christians to avoid punishment or payment—heretics and apostates—slaves fleeing from their masters—robbers, murderers, traitors and conspirators—those guilty of adultery, or rape, and the like. In subsequent and more modern times, however, the privilege of sanctuary came to be greatly abused to the perversion of justice and the encouragement of crime.

The rules respecting taking refuge in the churches required that no person fleeing thither should enter with weapons or arms, or make any seditious tumult; otherwise they forfeited the privilege. Nor, as has been observed, could any one eat or lodge in the church proper, but only some of the outer buildings.

---

[1] Synes. Ep. 58.

CHAPTER SECOND.

OF CATECHUMENS, AND THE FIRST USE OF CREEDS; AND OF THE THINGS CONCEALED FROM THE CATECHUMENS.

§ 101. *General names, age, and mode of admission.*

The name *catechumens* signifies such as receive the first rudiments of any science or art, and in the Christian Church was used of such as were instructed in the elements of Christian doctrine. Hence they are also called *Novitioli*, and *Tyrones Dei*, by Tertullian and Augustine.

As to the time of their being admitted catechumens—it may be remarked that the children of the faithful were baptized in infancy, and admitted as soon as they were capable of instruction; nor does it clearly appear that there was any precise age fixed for the admission of the children of heathen parents. It appears from a passage in Timothy, bishop of Alexandria, that such might be received before they were seven years old.[1]

Some ceremonies were observed at the reception of catechumens. These were imposition of hands and prayer, as appears by a canon of the council of Arles,[2] and of Eliberis,[3] where this is said to make such in a certain sense Christians, that is, admit them among the body of Christians. In this, also, as in most offices of the Church, the sign of the cross was used. Thus Augustine says "that catechumens were in some sort sanctified by the sign of Christ and the imposition of hands with prayer."[4]

§ 102. *Time and general method of catechetical instruction.*

In the apostolical age it does not appear that any considerable interval elapsed between conversion and admission to baptism and the eucharist. Nor did circumstances render it requisite. Subsequently the Church found it necessary to lengthen the period of probation. There seems however to have been no general rule fixing the period of continuing catechumens. The council of Eliberis[5] appointed two

---

[1] Timoth. Alex. Respons. ad, Can. Qu. 1. [2] Conc. Arelat. I. c. 5. [3] Conc. Eliber. c. 59. [4] August. de, Peccat. Merit. lib. 11. c. 26. [5] Can. 42.

years for new converts; the Apostolical Constitutions [1] fixes the time generally to three years, but allows admission to the sacraments sooner in case of proficiency and good conduct. In various cases the time was much shorter.

Generally however some considerable time was required to instruct them gradually in the elements of Christian doctrine. The course of instruction embraced the simplest principles relating to repentance and remission of sins, to faith, the nature of baptism, the articles of the creed; with some account of the canonical books of Scripture, and the general history of the Bible, the incarnation, passion and resurrection of Christ, and what is meant by renouncing the devil and his works, &c. It is to be observed that this course of instruction did not include the doctrine of the eucharist, or confirmation, and of some other matters of higher doctrine, which were reserved till afterwards. In the mean time they were allowed and directed in the reading of certain parts of the Scriptures suited to their state.

§ 103. *Classes of Catechumens.*

When the term of catechetical probation was prolonged to two or three years, for the more orderly and gradual proficiency of the catechumens, they were divided into *classes;* about the precise number of which there is not, however, a perfect agreement. Perhaps the practice varied in different times and places. Four classes are mentioned by some as existing in the ancient Church.

1. The lowest order were the Ἐξωθουμένοι, such as were privately instructed out of the church, and not allowed to attend its public services.

2. The next degree was that of *Hearers*, Ἀκροωμενοι, *Audientes*. They were admitted to hear sermons and the Scriptures read in the church, though not to stay at any of the prayers, but were to depart along with the unbelievers, when solemn proclamation, before the beginning of the liturgy, was made—"*let none of the hearers be present.*" Hence the council of Nice calls them "*hearers only*," to distinguish them from

3. The next higher order, who were called *Kneelers*, (*prostrati*, Γονυκλίνοντες, *genuflectentes*), and were permitted not only to hear the

[1] Lib. viii. c. 32.

Scriptures and sermons, but tarry and join in all that part of the liturgy called *missa catechumenorum*, which came immediately after the sermon together with the prayers for the energumens and penitents.[1] This class of catechumens then received imposition of hands, and benediction from the bishop and immediately departed.

4. The fourth and highest order of catechumens were called *competentes*, and *electi* and denoted those who having nearly completed the course of catechetical discipline were candidates for speedy baptism and admission to the eucharist. They were called *competentes* from their requesting this admission, and *electi* from having had the bishop's examination and approbation of their request. To such the words Βαπτιζόμενοι, and φωτιζόμενοι, which in strictness belonged only the baptized communicants, were yet frequently applied, as to *those who were about to be baptized and illuminated.*

§ 104. *Method of procedure in the further training and admission of the Competentes.*

The Competentes, petitioners or candidates for baptism and the eucharist, usually gave in their names upon the approach of Easter. The names of those that were accepted by the bishop, together with those of their sponsors, were registered in the books of the Church. Then followed repeated examinations as to their proficiency, directions for which may be seen in the canons of the fourth council of Carthage. They were then exorcised with prayer, imposition of hands, the sign of the cross and other usual ceremonies. This was done several times, some say for twenty days in succession, previous to baptism. And during this time they were further prepared by exercises of fasting, abstinence, confession and repentance. They were also to have by heart the words of the creed and the Lord's prayer—also the form of renouncing the devil and his works, of covenanting with Christ, and the responses connected with baptism; in the meaning of all which they were instructed and examined.

There were some other ceremonies of less note; such as going with their faces veiled for some days previous to baptism, to indicate and assist in securing abstraction of mind from external things,

[1] Conc. Nic. can. 14. Constit. Apost. lib. VIII. c. 5. Conc. Laod. c. 19.

touching the ears of catechumens and saying *Ephphata, be opened*, and some others; which do not appear to have generally prevailed.

§ 105. *The case of Catechumens falling into gross sin; of dying without baptism.*

Catechumens not being admitted to full communion with the Church, were not subject to the general rules of discipline for other offenders. They were however degraded from the higher to the lower classes, or the time of their probation was prolonged, according to the nature of their sins, for three or five years; and in some cases they were not admitted to baptism till near the time of death.

In case catechumens through their own neglect or fault died without baptism, they were not permitted the rites of Christian burial. The ancient Christians had a high view of the necessity of baptism. Yet they were not severe in their judgment and practice in regard to those dying without it, when the want of it did not proceed from neglect or contempt. They regarded the suffering of martyrdom for the cause of Christ as supplying the want of it. They also speak favourably of those catechumens who were suddenly cut off by death, while in a course of pious preparation for baptism. In case too a person presumed by the Church, and honestly considering himself, to have been duly baptized, had been for a course of years admitted to the eucharist, such an one was allowed, upon discovery of the mistake, still to continue without being baptized. A single act of communicating through ignorance or mistake, was not however thought to be a substitute for baptism, and in such a case the canons order the party to be immediately baptized.

§ 106. *Of Creeds, their names and nature.*

Notice may here properly be taken of creeds, inasmuch as a special design and use of them was originally in the instruction of catechumens. One of the most usual names for creeds among the ancient writers is *symbolum*. Three reasons for this name have been given by Baronius,[1] 1. because each Apostle contributed his *part* or *article* to the composition, and hence it was the *symbol* in the sense of their *collation;* 2. because it was a *mark or badge* of the true

[1] Baron, Ann. 44. n. 15.

Christian; 3. because it was a *collation* or comparative and *systematic epitome* of Christian doctrine. Suicer adds a fourth reason, because it was the token or *oath of the covenant* made at baptism, the word *symbolum* being used in contracts to denote the bond or covenant.[1] The second is the more generally received explanation.

Another usual name was *canon*, a *rule*, also *regula fidei*, *rule of faith*. The Greeks frequently called a creed the *determination or exposition of the faith* (Ὅρος or Ἔκθεσις Πίστεως) and sometimes briefly *the Faith*, (πίστις). In reference to the obligation of the catechumens to learn them, they were called *mathema*, *the lesson*, and sometimes also simply the *scripture* or *writing*.

§ 107. *Of the Apostles' Creed.*

It has been held, both by ancient and modern writers, that the creed commonly called the Apostles' Creed, was composed by them in the same form of words as now used. This opinion is however generally rejected, inasmuch as the writers of the three first centuries intimate no such thing, and the testimony of subsequent writers on the subject, only goes to prove that creeds in general were of apostolical institution, and that this creed is apostolical in regard to substance of doctrine. It is not to be doubted that the apostles used creeds, in substance the same, though probably not precisely agreeing in form; for, from the earliest times of the Church there was this liberty in different churches as to the form of their creeds, as well as their liturgies.

It is impossible to answer positively the question, what were the articles substantially included in the creeds of the apostles. Dr. Grabe, one of the ablest and most judicious writers on the subject, comes to the result—from various grounds of particular criticism, and from the general consent of all the earliest creeds, and the presumption afforded of a still earlier consent in the practice of the Church,—that all the articles of the so-called apostles' creed were professed in the confessions of the apostolic age and with apostolic sanction, except those relating to the descent of Christ into hell—to the Catholic Church—and to the communion of saints.[2]

---

[1] Suicer. Thesaur. Eccl. voce Συμβολην.

[2] Grabe, Annotat. in Bull. Judic. Eccles. Cathol. cap 5, 6, 7

§ 108. *Fragments of ancient Creeds.—Irenæus.*

It may be interesting to bring together several of the ancient forms of creeds, preserved in different writers, as illustrating the substantial unity of the Catholic Church, in the matter of doctrine. The first is taken from Irenæus, and is in these words:

"The Church, though it be dispersed over all the world from one end of the earth to the other, received from the apostles and their disciples, the belief in one God the Father, Almighty, maker of heaven, and earth, and sea, and all things in them: and in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who was incarnate for our salvation: and in the Holy Ghost, who preached by the prophets the dispensations of of God: and the advent, and nativity of a virgin, and passion, resurrection from the dead, and bodily ascension of the flesh of his beloved Son, Christ Jesus, our Lord, into heaven; and his coming again from heaven in the glory of the Father, to consummate all things, and raise the flesh of all mankind: that according to the will of the invisible Father, every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in the earth, and things under the earth, to Jesus Christ, our Lord, and God, and Saviour, and King; and that every tongue should confess him; and that He shall exercise just judgment upon all, and send spiritual wickednesses, the transgressing and apostate angels, with all ungodly, unrighteous, and blaspheming men, into everlasting fire; but grant life to all righteous and holy men, that keep his commandments and persevere in his love, some from the beginning, others after repentance, on whom he confers immortality and invests them with eternal glory."[1]

§ 109. *The Creed of Origen.*

There is another form of Apostolical doctrine given by Origen in his work on Christian principles:[2] "The things," says he, "which are manifestly handed down by Apostolical preaching are these: First, That there is one God, who created and made all things, and caused the whole universe to exist out of nothing; the God of all the just that ever were from the first creation and foundation of all; the God of Adam, Abel, Seth, Enos, Enoch, Noe, Sem, Abraham,

[1] Iren. lib. i. c. 1. p. 44. [2] Orig. περὶ Ἀρχῶν in Preafat. tom. i. p. 665.

Isaac, Jacob, the twelve Patriarchs, Moses and the prophets; and that this God in the last days, as he had promised before by his Prophets, sent our Lord Jesus Christ, first to call Israel and then the Gentiles, after the infidelity of his people Israel. This just and good God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, gave both the Law and the Prophets, and the Gospels, being the God of the Apostles, and of the Old and New Testament." The next article is, "that Jesus Christ, who came into the world, was begotten of the Father before every creature, who ministering to his Father in the creation of all things, (for by him all things were made,) in the last times made himself of no reputation and became man: he who was God, was made flesh, and when he was man, he continued the same God that he was before. He assumed a body in all things like ours, save only that it was born of a virgin by the Holy Ghost. And because this Jesus Christ was born and suffered death common to all, in truth, and not only in appearance, he was truly dead; for he rose again truly from the dead, and after his resurrection conversed with his disciples, and was taken up into heaven. They also delivered unto us, that the Holy Ghost was joined in the same honour and dignity with the Father and the Son."

§ 110. *Fragments of the Creed in Tertullian.*

The next writer in whose works we find fragments of the ancient creed is Tertullian. "There is," says he, "one rule of faith only which admits of no change or alteration, that teaches us to believe in one God Almighty, the Maker of the world; and in Jesus Christ his Son, who was born of the Virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate, the third day arose again from the dead, received into heaven, he sitteth now at the right hand of God, who shall come again to judge both the quick, and the dead, by the resurrection of the flesh." [1]

In his book *de Præscriptis*,[2] and also in that against Praxeas,[3] he has other forms substantially the same, with the addition of the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost, the Sanctifier and Comforter.

---

[1] Turtull. de Veland. Cap. 1. [2] Idem. de Præscript. cap. 13. [3] Idem. adv. Prax. cap. 2.

§ 111. *Fragments of the Creed in Cyprian.*

The next writer after Tertullian is Cyprian, in whose epistles, speaking of the instruction given to the catechumens, he enumerates all the articles given by the preceding writers. The articles of the communion of saints, and the descent into hell, are of later date.

§ 112. *Gregory Thaumaturgus.*

He was bishop of Neo-cæsarea, and lived not long after Cyprian. In his works we have the following form, which, though not a complete summary of faith, is particularly full against the two opposite heresies of the Samosatenians and Sabellians, one of which denied the divinity, and the other the distinct personality of Christ. It is in these words:[1] "There is one God, the Father of the living Word, the subsisting wisdom and power, the eternal express image of God, who is a perfect begetter of a perfect, a Father of an only begotten Son. And one Lord, one of one, God of God, the character and image of the Godhead, the word of power, the wisdom that comprehends the whole system of the world, the power that made every creature. The true Son of the true Father, invisible of invisible, incorruptible of incorruptible, immortal of immortal, eternal of eternal. And one Holy Ghost, who has his existence from God, who was manifested to men by the Son, the perfect image of the perfect Son, the living cause of all living, the fountain of holiness, essential sanctity, who is the author of holiness in others. In whom God the Father is manifested, who is above all and in all, and God the Son, whose power runs through all things. A perfect Trinity, whose glory, eternity and dominion is no way divided or separated from each other. In this Trinity, therefore, there is nothing created or servile, nothing adventitious or extraneous, that did not exist before, but afterward came into it. The Father was never without the Son, nor the Son without the Spirit, but the Trinity abides the same, unchangeable and invariable for ever."

§ 113. *Creed of Lucian the Martyr.*

He lived in the same age with Gregory. His form of confession is recorded by Athanasius, Socrates, and Hilary.[2] It is delivered by

[1] Greg. Neocæs. Opp. p. 1. et apud Greg. Nyssem. tom. iii. p. 546. [2] Athan. de Synod. Arimin. et Seleuc. tom. 1. p. 892. Socrat. lib. ii. c. 10. Hilar. de Synod. p. 107.

the last of these writers in these words: "We believe, according to the tradition of the Gospels, and Apostles, in one God, the Father, Almighty, Creator, and Maker, and Governor of all things, of whom are all things: and in one Lord, Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son, who is God, by whom are all things, who was begotten of the Father, God of God, Whole of Whole, One of One, Perfect of Perfect, King of King, Lord of Lord, the Word, the Wisdom, the Life, the true Light, the true Way, the Resurrection, the Shepherd, the Gate, the incommutable and unchangeable image of the divine essence, power and glory, the first-born of every creature, who was always from the beginning God the Word with God, according to what is said in the Gospel; 'and the Word was God,' by whom all things were made and in whom all things subsist, who in the last days descended from on high, and was born of a virgin according to the Scriptures, and being the Lamb of God, he was made the Mediator between God and men, being fore-ordained to be the author of our faith and life: for he said, 'I came not from heaven to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me.' Who suffered and rose again for us the third day, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; and he shall come again with glory to judge the quick and the dead. And we believe in the Holy Ghost, which is given to believers for their consolation, and sanctification, and consummation, according to what our Lord Jesus Christ appointed his disciples, saying, 'Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' Whence the properties of the Father are manifest, denoting him to be truly a father, and the properties of the Son, denoting him to be truly a son, and the properties of the Holy Spirit, denoting him to be truly the Holy Ghost: these names not being simply put and to no purpose, but to express the particular subsistence, or hypostatic substance, as the Greeks term it, of each person named, so as to denote them to be three in hypostasis, and one by consent."

§ 114. *Apostolical Constitutions.*

The author of the Apostolical Constitutions is generally supposed to have written in the latter part of the third century. In this work the profession to be made by the catechumens is in these words:[1] "I believe, and am baptized in one unbegotten, the only true God

[1] Const. Apost. lib. vii. c. 41.

Almighty, the Father of Christ, the Creator and Maker of all things, of whom are all things: and in one Lord Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son, the first-born of every creature, who before all ages was begotten, not made, by the good will of the Father, by whom all things were made in Heaven and in Earth, visible and invisible; who in the last times came down from Heaven, and taking flesh upon him, was born of the Holy Virgin Mary, and lived a holy life according to the laws of God his Father, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and died for us, and the third day, after he had suffered, rose again from the dead and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and shall come again with glory in the end of the world to judge both the quick and dead, of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And I am baptized into the Holy Ghost, that is to say, the Comforter, which wrought effectually in all the Saints from the beginning of the world and was afterwards sent to the Apostles by the Father, according to the promise of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and after the Apostles to all others, who in the Holy Catholic Church believe the resurrection of the flesh, the remission of sins, the kingdom of heaven, and the life of the world to come."

§ 115. *Creed of Jerusalem.*

The creed of the Church of Jerusalem is found in the catechisms of Cyril, bishop of that church, and is collected in the following form:[1] "I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisble; and one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all ages, the true God, by whom all things were made, who was incarnate and made man, who was crucified and buried, and the third day he rose again from the dead, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and shall come to judge the quick and dead, of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And in the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, who spake by the prophets. In one baptism of repentance, in the remission of sins, in one Catholic Church, in the resurrection of the flesh, and in life everlasting."

[1] Cyril. Cateches. 6, &c.

§ 116. *Creed of Alexandria.*

This is found in Socrates,[1] in these words: "We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ his Son, our Lord, God the Word, begotten of Him before all ages; by whom all things were made, that are in heaven and in earth; who came down from heaven, and was incarnate, and suffered, and rose again, and ascended into heaven, and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost, and in the resurrection of the flesh, and in the life of the world to come, and in the kingdom of heaven, and in one Catholic Church of God extended from one end of the earth to the other."

§ 117. *Creed of Antioch.*

This is found in Cassian,[2] who gives it as it was probably received in that church from the times of the apostles—except that the word *consubstantial* was inserted after the council of Nice.

"The text and faith of the Creed of Antioch," says he, "is this: I believe in one only true God, the Father, Almighty, Maker of all creatures visible and invisible: and in Jesus Christ our Lord, his only begotten Son, the first born of every creature, born of Him before all ages, and not made, very God of very God, consubstantial with the Father; by whom the world was framed and all things made: who for our sakes came, and was born of the Virgin Mary, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried, and the third day rose according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead."

§ 118. *Roman Creed, called the Apostles' Creed.*

It will be perceived that the articles concerning the communion of saints, and the descent into hell, are not expressly mentioned in the foregoing creeds. Nor were they originally in the Roman or apostles' creed, which was in these words:"[3] "I believe in God, the Father, Almighty; and in Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son, our Lord, who was born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, and was

[1] Socrates, lib. i. cap. 26. [2] Cassian. de Incarnat. lib. vi. p. 1272. [3] Usher, de Symbolis, p. 6.

crucified under Pontius Pilate, and was buried, and the third day rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, sitteth on the right hand of the Father, whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Church, the remission of sins, and the resurrection of the flesh. Amen."

§ 119. *Creed of Aquileia.*

In this creed the article of eternal life is not expressly mentioned, though it was understood to be implied in that of the resurrection, which article is expressed in a peculiar form. The descent into hell is mentioned, and this is the only creed of the age, (excepting that of the council of Sirmium, mentioned by Socrates[1]) in which this article is inserted. It is given by Ruffin[2] in these words:

"I believe in God, the Father, Almighty, invisible and impassible: and in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord, who was born by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried; he descended into hell, and the third day rose again from the dead, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church, the remission of sins, and the resurrection of this flesh."

§ 120. *The Nicene Creed as first published by the council of Nice.*

The foregoing creeds comprise all that may be considered as used in the Church previous to the Nicene council, A. D. 325. The Nicene creed as first published by that council was in these words:[3] "We believe in one God Almighty, Maker of all things, visible and invisible; and in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, the only-begotten, that is, of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, of one substance with the Father; by whom all things both in heaven and earth were made: who for us men and our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate and made man, and suffered, and the third day rose again, and ascended into heaven, and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost. And those who say, there was a time when the Son

[1] Socrates, lib. ii. cap. 37. [2] Ruffin. Expos. Symbol. ad calcem Cypr. p. 19.
[3] Ap. Socrat. lib. 1. c. 8.

of God was not, or that he did not exist before he was made, because he was made out of nothing, or of another substance or essence, or that he was created or mutable, the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes them."

§ 121. *The Nicene Creed as completed by the council of Constantinople.*

That the Nicene creed, as set forth by that council, did not comprise the whole of the ancient creed used in the Church and taught to the catechumens, is considered as clear from Cyril's catechisms, and from Epiphanius.[1] The second general council of Constantinople, A. D. 381, therefore completed it by the addition of the articles that were wanting, and published it in the same form that it now has in our book of Common Prayer, except that in the article concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost "from the Father"—the Latin Church added the words: "and the Son."

"I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and of all things visible and invisible: "And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of his Father before all worlds; God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made; who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from Heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried, and the third day he rose again, according to the Scriptures, and ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; and he shall come again, with glory, to judge both the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end.

"And I believe in the Holy Ghost the Lord and giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father [and the Son] who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets. And I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church, I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins; and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. *Amen.*"

This creed was used in all the eastern churches for the instruction

[1] Cyril. Catech. 6, &c.—Epiphan. Anchorat. n. 120. tom ii. p. 122.

of catechumens at their baptism; but it was not made a part of the daily liturgy, nor of the communion service, till about the middle of the fifth century in the Greek Church, and not till some time after in the Latin Church.[1]

§ 122. *The Athanasian Creed.*

This creed may be given here, for though not found in our Liturgy, it is appointed to be recited on some occasions in the English Church, and in other churches. It has its name from being attributed to Athanasius;[2] but the best and latest critics ascribe the authorship of it to a later and Latin writer.[3] It is in these words: "Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith.

Which Faith, except every one do keep whole and undefiled: without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.

And the Catholic Faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity:

Neither confounding the Persons: nor dividing the Substance.

For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost.

But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all one: the Glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal.

Such as the Father is, such is the Son: and such is the Holy Ghost.

The Father uncreate, the Son uncreate: and the Holy Ghost uncreate.

The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible: and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible.

The Father eternal, the Son eternal: and the Holy Ghost eternal;

And yet they are not three eternals: but one eternal.

As also there are not three incomprehensibles, nor three uncreated: but one uncreated, and one incomprehensible.

So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty: and the Holy Ghost Almighty;

And yet they are not three Almighties: but one Almighty.

---

[1] See Bingham, B. x. ch. iv. § 17. [2] Baronius, Ann. 40. 340. n. 11. Bona, de Psalm. Petav. Not. in Epiphan. Hæres. 72. Bellarmin. de Scriptor. Eccles. p. 81. [3] Voss. de Symb. Quesnel. Pearson, Usher. Cave, &c.

So the Father is God, the Son is God: and the Holy Ghost is God.

And yet they are not three Gods: but one God.

So likewise, the Father is Lord, the Son Lord: and the Holy Ghost Lord.

And yet not three Lords: but one Lord.

For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity: to acknowledge every Person by himself to be God and Lord;

So are we forbidden by the Catholic Religion: to say, There be three Gods, or three Lords.

The Father is made of none: neither created, nor begotten.

The Son is of the Father alone: not made, nor created, but begotten.

The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son: neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.

So there is one Father, not three Fathers: one Son, not three Sons: one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts.

And in this Trinity none is afore or after other: none is greater, or less than another;

But the whole three Persons are co-eternal together: and co-equal.

So that in all things as is aforesaid: the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity, is to be worshipped.

He therefore that will be saved: must thus think of the Trinity.

Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation: that he also believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

For the right Faith is, that we believe and confess: that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man;

God, of the Substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds: and Man, of the Substance of his Mother, born in the world;

Perfect God, and perfect Man: of a reasonable soul, and human flesh subsisting;

Equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead: and inferior to the Father, as touching his Manhood.

Who although he be God and Man; yet he is not two, but one Christ;

One; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh: but by taking of the Manhood into God;

One altogether; not by confusion of Substance: but by unity of Person.

For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man: so God and Man is one Christ;

Who suffered for our salvation: descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead.

He ascended into Heaven, he sitteth on the right hand of the Father God Almighty; from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies: and shall give account for their own works.

And they that have done good, shall go into life everlasting: and they that have done evil, into everlasting fire.

This is the Catholic Faith: which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved.

§ 123. *Of the Romish pretences concerning things concealed from the catechumens.*

Many Romish writers derive a justification of the corruptions of their Church from certain ungrounded assumptions concerning the things concealed from catechumens, and the reasons of it. This is connected with their doctrine concerning traditional authority. When asked why no traces are to be found of many of their doctrines and practices in the early writers of the Church—their reply is, that these were a part of the secret doctrines, not committed to writing, lest they should be known to the catechumens, but handed down only by tradition among the initiated. This is the reason given by Schelstrate, Pagi,[1] &c., why the first writers of the Church give no account of the seven sacraments, the worship of saints, images, &c. &c. The falsity of these pretences will be seen from a true account of the origin, nature, and reasons of the discipline of the Church in regard to this point.

For it is the opinion of many learned writers that this practice of concealment was not strictly observed in the very first ages of the Church; and Basnage is of opinion that the apostles, so far from concealing the mysteries from the catechumens, administered the sacraments in their presence.[2] Certain it is that the apostles use no concealment of their opinions in regard to the worship of

[1] Pagi, Crit. in Baron. Ann. 118. n. 9. [2] Basnage, Exercit. in Baron. p. 489.

angels, saints, &c.; for they condemn it;—and as to baptism and the eucharist they speak with freedom.

The first writer that makes any mention of the practice of concealment is Tertullian,[1] who speaks of this as the discipline of the Catholic Church, and blames the heretics for neglecting it. Yet this discipline at that time covered up no such doctrines or practices as the Romanists pretend; for Tertullian speaks openly of the worship of saints, angels, images, &c.—condemning them with indignation, as *being no part of the Christian mysteries*, but practices only of the heathen or heretics.

§ 124. *Of the things really concealed.*

The things that were in some measure kept from the catechumens were: 1. The manner of performing baptism. They were not allowed to see this rite performed, nor to enter or look into the baptistery. Nor were the catechumens instructed concerning the outward manner of its administration, but simply concerning its spiritual nature and significance. 2. The manner of administering confirmation was likewise kept from the observation of the catechumens. 3. Also the ordination of priests. The council of Laodicea has a canon upon this point.[2] 4. Certain prayers of the Church the catechumens were likewise forbidden to stay and hear. One class of catechumens the *audientes*, or *hearers*, were permitted to hear only the sermon, but not any of the prayers. Another class the *prostrati*, or *kneelers*, were permitted to hear the prayers of the Church for themselves but no others. The *competentes* staid only to hear the prayers for themselves and for the energumens, and were then dismissed—not being permitted to hear the prayers for the penitents, nor their absolution, nor the ante-communion service. 5. Nor were any of the catechumens permitted to be present at the celebration of the eucharist. One class of penitents—the highest class, called *consistentes*, or *co-standers*—were allowed to be present, though not to partake; but catechumens of every class were excluded from seeing the celebration of this sacrament, as well as from all plain discourses concerning it.

---

[1] Tertull. Apol. c. 7.—de Præscript. c. 41. [2] Conc. Laod. can. 5.

§ 125. *The true reasons of concealing these things from the catechumens.*

The true reasons why these things were kept in any measure from the catechumens, was in general the benefit of the catechumens; more particularly: 1. That the plainness and simplicity of these rites might not be contemned before their true nature was understood.—For the same reason, in a stronger degree, they were kept from the sight of the heathen: 2. to conciliate the greater reverence for them; as St. Basil says: "the veneration of mysteries is preserved by silence:" [1] 3. to make the catechumens more desirous to know them, and to quicken their zeal in the pursuit of Christian knowledge and piety.[2]

---

[1] Basil, de Spir. Sanct. c. 27. [2] August. Serm. 1. Hom. 96. in Joh.—in Psal. 109.

BOOK FOURTH.

CHAPTER FIRST.

RITES AND CUSTOMS OBSERVED IN RESPECT TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF BAPTISM IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

§ 126. *Names and appellations given to baptism.*

It is not intended here to go into a history of all the doctrines connected with baptism, nor of the opinions of the early Christians on these subjects; but merely to consider the most material things concerning the administration of it in the practice of the primitive Church. Some of the principal names and appellations by which it was spoken of may be first mentioned. These were taken, some with reference to the spiritual effects of it—some from the nature of the act—some from the conditions required of the receivers—and some from the external circumstances of the administration.

With reference to its significance and intended effects, it was sometimes called the sacrament of *indulgence, or absolution and remission of sins*, or briefly the *indulgence*,[1] also *regeneration*,[2] *unction*, *illumination*[3] and *Salus*, or *salvation*, a name also very commonly applied among the African Christians to the eucharist.[4]

With reference to its nature and substance it had the names of the *mystery*, the *sacrament*, and the *signaculum*, the *seal* or *sign*:[5] also *Character Dominicus*, the *mark or character of the Lord.*

With reference to the conditions required of receivers, it was called the *sacrament of faith and repentance.*[6]

From the circumstances and manner of administration, come the names of *baptism*, *tinction lavation*, and some others which it is not necessary to mention.

---

[1] Conc. Carth. ap. Cypr. n. 19. p. 234. Conc. Rom. can. 7. ap. Coteler. in Const. Apost. lib. iii. c. 9. August. de Bapt. lib. v. c. 21. [2] Cyril. Catech. Præf. n. 10. [3] Greg. Naz. Orat. 40. de bapt. Conc. Laod. c. 47. [4] August. de Pec. merit. lib. i. cap. 24. [5] Tertul. de Spectat. c. 4. Const. Apost. lib. ii. c. 14. Optat. lib. iii. p. 72. [6] Fulgent. de Fide ad Petrum. c. 50.

§ 127. *Of the matter of Baptism; rejected or corrupted by some heretics.*

The Church always regarded the application of water as the necessary material element of baptism. If this was neglected, or anything else used instead, the baptism was regarded not merely as irregular, but as null—and a new baptism was required. Thus when a certain Jew had been baptized in sand for want of water in the desert, the bishop of Ascalon ordered him to be re-baptized; and this, in the opinion of Archbishop Whitgift, following the Centuriators, was not because the baptism had been performed by a layman as a case of extreme necessity, but "because the baptism wanted water."[1] Thus, too St. Ambrose says, that if we take away water, the sacrament of baptism (*mysterium regenerationis*,) cannot stand.[2]

The ancient Church always insisted much upon the performance of this sacrament, though judging favorably of such catechumens as died without it, not through contempt, but through necessity; and it is a frequent subject of accusation and condemnation made by Catholic writers against many of the ***Heretics*** that they neglected and corrupted the doctrine of baptism. Among those heretics who in various ways denied or corrupted baptism were the Valentinians, Seleucians, Manicheans, Paulicians, &c.

§ 128. *The ancient form of baptism.*

The administration of this rite in the ancient Church was generally in such a form of words as made express mention of every person of the Trinity. Thus says Tertullian: "the law of baptizing was imposed and the form prescribed 'Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'"[3] And Augustine says this was not only the general practice of the Catholic Church, but of the heretics also: "for one might more easily find heretics that did not baptize at all, than such as retained baptism without using those evangelical words, without which baptism cannot be consecrated."[4]

This form of words was held to be so necessary that the Apostolical

---

[1] Joh. Moschus, Pratum Spirit. c. 176. Whitgift, Defence, tract. ix. p. 519. Cent. Magdeb. cent. ii. c. 6. p. 82. [2] Ambros. de iis qui initiantur. c.4.
[3] Tertull. de bapt. c. 13. [4] August de bapt. lib. vi. c. 25.

Canons order every bishop and presbyter presuming to baptize otherwise, to be deposed.[1] Thus Athanasius declares any other baptism than that into the names of the Trinity null; for baptism he says is not given but in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.[2] These are merely instances from multitudes of similar testimonies of the early writers as to the universal consent and practice of the Catholic Church—with whom likewise agreed the practice of most heretics who used baptism at all. There were however some heretical sects—as the Priscillianists, Montanists, the Sabellians—who in various ways corrupted this form.

§ 129. *Of the administrators of baptism.*

About the question whether the administration of baptism by a duly ordained and authorised minister is of the essence or being of baptism, or only of its well-being; and consequently whether lay-baptism be invalid and null, or simply irregular—there has been considerable difference of opinion. The question is here taken up only so far as relates to the opinion and practice of the ancient Church.

The sense of the primitive Church was that the apostles received power both to baptize, and at their discretion to commission others to baptize; and that in the exercise of this discretion they not only gave commission to the bishops, presbyters and deacons, but in extraordinary cases allowed laymen, to perform the rite. As the successors of the apostles, the *bishops* were regarded as having the same power in this matter; and this power must be considered as a power to authorize or prohibit at their discretion; otherwise it is impossible to account for the fact that the ancient bishops sometimes restrained deacons from baptizing, as well as laymen, and sometimes granted authority to both. Thus the power of baptizing was held to be lodged solely in the bishops, with the right of delegating it to whomsoever they saw fit—either by a standing and general, or by a special and particular commission—and that baptisms performed by such delegated authority were reputed not only as valid, but as duly authorized.[3]

---

[1] Can. Apost. c. 49. [2] Athanas. Ep. ad. Serapion. t. i. p. 204. Orat. 5. Orat. 5. Contr. Arian. p. 535. [3] Conc. Rom. can. vii. ap. Coteler. Not. in Const. Apost. iii. 9.—Conc. Carth. ap. Cypr. n. 79.—Can. Apost. c. 39.—Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. 8.

In inquiring into the practice of the ancient Church, it is necessary to bear in mind the distinction between an unauthorized and irregular baptism, and one that was invalid and null;—and between a standing and a special commission; and also between the power to baptize in ordinary and in extraordinary cases.

§130. *Baptism by presbyters and deacons.*

Presbyters had a standing commission to baptize at their discretion in all ordinary cases, yet still as by a derived authority, and subject to any special directions of the bishop. Hence baptisms performed by a priest in opposition to any such direction or consent, were esteemed irregular and wrong in regard to the minister; but not invalid and null in regard to the person baptized, so as to require a re-baptism, provided it was duly done as to the matter and form.[1]

As to deacons—some ancient canons ascribe to them the same right of baptism in ordinary cases as to the presbyters. So it was understood by Tertullian; and so by Jerome.[2] So in the practice of the Spanish Church at the time of the council of Eliberis;[3] and so in that of the Church of Palestine.[4]

Yet some ancient canons seem to forbid the administration of baptism to the deacons as a part of their ordinary duties. The Apostolical Canons has four articles which speak of the ministers of baptism—in which deacons are not mentioned.[5] The Apostolical Constitutions has several canons to the same effect;[6] and some which speak expressly against deacons baptizing, as in the following: "a presbyter is to teach, to offer the eucharist, to baptize, and to give the blessing to the people; but a deacon is only to minister to the bishop and presbyters, and not to perform the rest."[7]

All this however must refer to baptizing as an *ordinary* power, for the same Apostolical Constitutions allow that a deacon may properly baptize if he has a special commission and authority from his bishop to do it.[8] Thus Chrysostom, excluding deacons from the ordinary power of baptizing, expressly allows them to do it in extraordinary cases; for says he "if there be a necessity, and a child be

---

[1] Ambros. de Sacram. lib. iii. c. 1. [2] Tertull. de bapt. c. 17.—Hieron. Dial. contr. Lucif. c. 4. [3] Conc. Eliber. c. 77. [4] Cyril. Catech. xvii. n. 17. [5] Can. Apost. 46, 47, 49, 50. [6] Const. Apost. lib. iii. c. 11. [7] Idem. lib. iii. c. 20.—lib. viii. c. 28. [8] Const. Apost. lib. viii. c. 46.

found ready to die unbaptized, it is lawful for a deacon to do it."[1] Many other authorities to the same purport.

§ 131. *Inferior clergy and laymen forbidden to baptize in ordinary cases.*

The author under the name of St. Ambrose says: "that from the time of the apostles, the inferior clergy and laymen were prohibited to baptize."[2] So also in the Apostolical Constitutions in regard to laymen a prohibition is expressly found in three places. "We do not permit laymen to perform any sacerdotal office, as the sacrament of the eucharist, or baptism, or confirmation or imposition of hands, or the lesser or greater benediction," &c.[3]

§ 132. *Yet allowed in extraordinary cases.*

In cases of extreme necessity when no public minister could be procured, the general practice of the Church allowed of baptisms by laymen. This is Tertullian's sense of the matter;[4] and is confirmed by acts of the council of Eliberis,[5] by the testimony of Jerome,[6] of Augustine, and others. The council of Nice moreover never made any decree about the re-baptizing of persons baptized by laymen simply—though they did make such a decree in regard to baptisms by some heretics. There are some exceptions also in the case of particular churches, who disallowed the validity of lay-baptism in any case; still the general opinion and practice allowed it in extraordinary cases.

§ 133. *Usurped and unauthorised baptism.*

Thus much concerning baptisms which were not only valid as to the subjects, but authorised and lawful as to the performers. The next point is concerning the usurped and unauthorised administration of baptism. This was universally held to be irregular and wrong—but not equally thought to render the sacrament invalid and null to the receiver, so as that he should be rebaptized. This is the sense of Augustine, and of Optatus.[7]

---

[1] Chrys. Hom. 61. tom. vii. Ed. Savil. p. 423. [2] Ambros. Com in Eph. iv. [3] Const. Apost. lib. iii. c. 10. lib. ii. c. 27. lib. viii. c. 46. [4] Tertull. de Bapt. lib. iii. c. 10. [5] Conc. Eliber. c. 38. [6] Hieron. contr. Lucif. c. 4. [7] August. contr. Parmen. ii. 13.—Optat. contr. Parmen. v. p. 90.

§ 134. *The administration of baptism by women.*

This it would seem is absolutely forbidden both in ordinary and extraordinary cases. Thus, Tertullian, allowing to laymen the right of baptizing in cases of extraordinary necessity and the absence of a regular minister, forbids it to women in all cases whatever.[1] In another place he says, "it is not permitted to women to speak in the Church; but neither may they teach, nor baptize, nor offer the oblation, nor assume any office belonging to men—much less those that appertained to the priests."[2] The fourth council of Carthage makes an express prohibition to the same effect.[3] Jerome, Augustine and other writers are silent as to any authority of women to baptize.

As to the question: whether baptisms performed by women in the exercise of this usurped and unlawful authority were utterly null and to be repeated—it is difficult to give a decisive reply. There can be no doubt that those who rejected the baptisms of heretical men as null, rejected also those performed by heretical women. Thus Tertullian, Cyprian, &c. It is probable also, but not clear, that baptisms performed by women, whether heretical or catholic, were in all cases regarded as invalid by those even who admitted the validity of baptisms by heretical men.

§ 135. *Baptism by heretics, schismatics and degraded Clergymen.*

On this subject there was an universal agreement that baptisms administered by such persons were without any legal authority from the Church; and were sinful and wrong in respect to to the administrators. But upon the further question: whether they were invalid and to be repeated by authorised persons, provided they had been duly done as to the matter and form—there was very considerable diversity of opinion. Thus in the third century Cyprian and his followers contended for the invalidity of unauthorised baptism in all cases, while Augustine and others declared themselves for its validity and against re-baptizing. Yet it is to be remarked that those who held this latter opinion, made an exception in regard to some *heretics*,

---

[1] Tertull, de Bapt. c. 17. [2] Id. de Veland. Virg. [3] Conc. Carth. iv. Can. 100.

such, that is, as corrupted the *matter* of baptism by water or its *form* in not baptizing in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. And some of these also went so far as to require not only the due form, but also a right faith in the Trinity on the part of the performers—as in regard to Arian baptism; but the generality of the Church were of a different opinion. In the following ages, as well as in the third century, there was a diversity of opinion in regard to this point—the general principle however being substantially as above stated. The sum of the whole matter is thus given by Bingham in his Scholastical History of Lay-baptism: "the result of our inquiry concerning heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clergymen is this: 1. they all act in opposition to the Church's authority, and therefore have not her lawful authority to baptize. 2. Notwithstanding this, their baptisms, if done in due form, are valid and not to be repeated. Yet, 3. those baptisms have great deficiencies, particularly that they do not minister remission of sins and other invisible graces of the Holy Spirit, except where it pleases God to supply them in extraordinary mercy and in an extraordinary way, which deficiencies are to be supplied by imposition of hands and invocation of the Holy Spirit upon their repentance and return to the Catholic Church. 4. And this whether heretics acting in that capacity be considered either as clergymen, or laymen, or in a middle state between both: for whatever capacity they act in, their baptisms are not properly the legal and authorised baptisms of the Church, and therefore have need of some subsequent authority to confirm them. This is the sum of the doctrine of the ancients, concerning the baptism of heretics and their reception into the Church." [1]

§ 136. *The subjects of Baptism.*

In general none but persons, adult or infant, and in their personal capacity, were reckoned subjects of baptism by the primitive Church. Of course there is no ground in ancient practice for the Romish cus-

---

[1] Bingham. Scholast. Hist. of Lay-baptism, ch. i. § 22. I have thought it might be interesting to some readers to have before them in this connection a brief view of the doctrine and practice of the modern Churches, particularly of the Church of England. A chapter on the subject, taken from the work of Bingham above cited, will therefore be found at the end of this volume.

tom of baptizing bells and other inanimate things. The first mention of this custom is in the time of Charlemagne, in the ninth century.[1]

There is another superstitious custom which was sometimes practised in more ancient times—that of baptising after death those who died without baptism. This is noticed and condemned by the third council of Carthage and others.[2] Another absurd practice prevalent among some *heretics*, was that of vicarious baptism—that is, when one died without baptism, another person was baptized in his stead. This practice they justified by the passage in St. Paul, (1. Cor. xv.) "if the dead rise not, why then are we baptized for the dead." But Chrysostom more rationally supposes the apostle to refer to the creed in which every catechumen when baptized, professes his belief in the resurrection of the dead, as one of the articles of the Christian faith; so that the passage is an eliptical expression, meaning, "if there be not a resurrection of the dead why does the Church baptize in the belief the resurrection of the dead." [3]

§ 137. *Practice of infant baptism in the primitive Church.*

The opinion has been held by some learned men that for the two first ages of the Church no one received baptism till of age to understand and profess in proper person the things requisite; in other words, that infant baptism was not practised for the two first ages—but came in after that, upon the opinion of the necessity of baptism to salvation.

Now upon this subject it may be conceded that the very earliest writers are not so explicit as subsequent ones, in declaring the actual *practice* of the Church in regard to infant baptism. Yet at the same time it is very clear, that the necessity of baptism for all on the ground of the universality of original corruption, was no new opinion introduced in the third century—but was as fully held in the first and second ages. Thus Clemens Romanus, and Hermes Pastor, writers who lived in the *apostolic age*, though they do not speak in express terms of infant baptism, yet decidedly speak of the corrup-

---

[1] Capitular. Carol. Mag. in Durant. de ritibus, Eccles. lib. i. c. 22. [2] Conc. Carth. iii. can. 6. &c. [3] Chrysost. Hom. 40. 1 Cor. &c.

tion of all and the necessity of baptism as the mode of entrance to the Church, and to the participation of spiritual washing.[1]

So in the *second century*, Justin Martyr, and the author of the Recognitions, hold the same view of universal corruption, and give reasons for baptism which would apply to infants equally with adults.[2] Justin Martyr in particular draws an illustration of baptism from circumcision which would include infants—and moreover in another place speaks of persons of his acquaintance sixty and seventy years old who had been *made disciples to Christ from infancy;* and if this taken to mean, *baptized in infancy*—of which there can be little doubt—it would follow that infant baptism was practised in the *apostolic age;* for Justin wrote his Apology about the year 148, and sixty or seventy years before would be in the times of the apostles.[3]

Still more clear in regard to the sense of the Church in the second century, and by inference as to the practice of a still earlier period, is the testimony of Irenæus. He was born about the year 97, and was a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of St. John. About the year 176, he wrote his book against the heresies—being then near eighty years old. Three things are considered by some writers as clear from his writings: 1. that the Church then believed the doctrine of original sin; 2. that the ordinary means of purging away this sin was baptism; 3. that infants as well as adults were then actually baptized. In regard to the latter point he says: "Christ came to save all persons by himself; all I say who by him are regenerated unto God—infants, and little ones, and children, and youth, and elder persons."[4] Upon this passage the only question is, whether by "those who are regenerated" is meant *those who are baptized.* Now although in speaking of what was necessary to salvation the early writers never considered mere outward baptism as availing without an inward, spiritual renovation, nor considered the inward grace as always and necessarily accompanying the outward rite,—yet it is clear, and is a given point among the learned, that when the word *regeneration* simply is used by the ancient writers,

---

[1] Clem. Rom. Ep. 1. ad Cor. n. 17.—Hermes Past. lib. i. Vis. iii. c. 3. [2] Just. Mart. Apol. ii. p. 94. Dial. cum. Tryph. p. 315.—Recognition, lib. vi. n. 9.—[3] Just. Mart. Dial. c. Typh. p. 261. Apol. ii. p. 62. [4] Iren. lib. ii. c. 39.

they always either mean or include baptism. So Irenæus himself elsewhere calls baptism regeneration.

The writings of Tertullian, who lived in the latter part of the second century, and beginning of the third, shed light upon the practice of the Church. His opinion was for deferring the baptism of infants, when there was no danger of death. Yet it is sufficiently clear that this was his private opinion and contrary to the prevailing practice of the Church. This is obvious from the whole method of his arguing on this point.[1] The writings of Origen, in the beginning of the *third* century, expressly declare infant baptism, as the practice of the Church, and as of apostolic institution; thus in one place he says; "infants are baptized for the remission of sins;" and in another place, that "the Church received from the Apostles the order of baptizing infants."[2]

From and after this period there is no need of examining the testimonies on the point; for it is admitted on all hands that infant baptism was the custom of the Church in the third century. And it only remains to remark that the way and manner in which the practice is spoken of by writers of this period, is such as to lead to the conclusion that it was no new or recent thing; but, when joined with what of evidence has been adduced from an earlier period, goes to establish it as at that time an ancient and settled usage of the Church derived from apostolical institution.

§ 138. *The time of infant baptism.*

There were some in the African Church who thought that baptism should be deferred till the eighth day from birth in imitation of the time of circumcision. But Cyprian and the council of Carthage decided against this,—nor did any such rule obtain in the Church. Gregory Nazianzen maintained the opinion, that unless the probability of death required its earlier baptism, a child should not be baptized till three years. He was however singular in this opinion, and no such rule ever obtained. Yet it was a very prevalent custom to defer the baptism of infants to some of the greater festivals of the Church, particularly till Easter—unless there was apparent danger of death.[3]

---

[1] Tertull. de Bapt. c. 18. [2] Orig. in. Luc. Hom. 14. Hom. in Rom. lib. v. c. 6.
[3] Socrat. H. E. lib. v. cap. 22. Conc. Bracar. 2. can. 9. August. Serm. 160.

§ 139. *Some questions touching infants that might be baptized.*

One question made was whether infants might be baptized when only one parent was Christian. This is decided in the affirmative so far as the practice of the Church can be gathered. It was so ruled by the council of Toledo, in regard to children one of whose parents remained unconverted Jews.[1]

The children of excommunicated parents were not refused baptism in the general practice of the Church; though there were cases in which this was done.

And in general all infants, of whatsoever parentage, upon coming under the care of Christians and being brought by suitable sponsors, were admitted to baptism.

§ 140. *Of adult baptism; what persons admitted.*

No persons but infants could be admitted to baptism without some knowledge of Christianity and a credible profession of faith. To this end all who were of years and understanding to make a profession for themselves were required, previous to baptism, to be instructed and examined in their knowledge and faith. They usually passed some time in the state of catechumens, as has been described. Yet there were some exceptions in extraordinary cases, in regard to persons suddenly seized with some sickness or infirmity which disabled them from understanding or making the proper professions in their own persons at the time of baptism, who nevertheless were admitted to the rite.—There is a rule in the Apostolical Constitutions which forbids the admission of slaves to baptism without the testimony of their masters (provided they were Christians) as to the life and character of the candidate.[2] Yet baptism was to be a voluntary act on the part of all who were of years to understand its nature, and no person was to be compelled in any way to receive it.

On the other hand there were several sorts of persons who might not be admitted to baptism. Among these were all such as gained their livelihood by any scandalous trades or professions, inconsistent with Christianity; such as panders, makers of idol-images, stage-

[1] Conc. Tolet. 4. can. 62.

[2] Const. Apost. lib. viii. c. 32.

actors, and the like; also gladiators, charioteers, and other practicers in the public games; who were required to renounce such pursuits and callings or else were rejected from baptism.[1] The same Apostolical Constitutions likewise prohibit from baptism all practicers of curious and occult arts—magicians, diviners, astrologers, makers of amulets, &c.; and all frequenters of the theatres, public games, and other spectacles founded upon and connected with idolatrous religions and heathen superstitions and practices.

It has been thought that the profession of a soldier was required to be renounced, or else baptism was refused in the early Church. This is stated on the authority of the Nicene council, which has a canon in these words: "if any who by the grace of God made confession of the faith, and cast away the military girdle, afterward return to their vomit again, so as to give money to buy a place in the army, let them be ten years among the prostrators, after they have been three years among the hearers."[2] This canon is however differently interpreted by many persons, and is generally thought not to imply an absolute prohibition of the military profession; but only in special cases, as where being a soldier would necessarily imply the taking of idolatrous or unchristian oaths and engagements,—or where the military life was inconsistent with other particular Christian duties.

§ 141. *Of the time of Baptism.*

It was the practice of the Church to admit to baptism in general at such time as the candidates were sufficiently instructed and prepared. This as has been noticed was sometimes longer or shorter. But besides this the Church also deferred the baptism of some persons by way of discipline and punishment—sometimes five, ten, or twenty years or more, and in some cases even to the hour of death.[3]

Others deferred their baptism of their own accord and against the rules of the Church—some from negligence—some from unwillingness to renounce the world and submit to the rules of religion—some from a fear of falling into sin after baptism, and from a superst-

[1] Const. Apost. lib. viii c. 32.—Tertull. de Idololat. c. 11.—Conc. Eliber. c. 62.—Conc. Carth. iii. c. 35. [2] Conc. Nic. can. 12. [3] Conc. Elib. can. 78. can. 11. can. 63..

tious belief in the efficacy of baptism to secure their salvation if received at the point of death—some from superstitious fancies in regard to certain times and ministers—and some from a pretence of following the example of Christ, who was not baptized till thirty years old.

All this was against the rules of the Church, who had but two reasons for deferring baptism and of which she made herself judge—the one was, to prepare the catechumens for it by instruction,—the other, to reform them by penance and discipline if they had lapsed while in the state of catechumens.

§ 142. *Solemn times of baptizing in ordinary cases.*

The Church appointed certain stated periods for baptism in ordinary cases, leaving her ministers still at liberty to baptize at other times if propriety required. The most solemn of these times was Easter—next Pentecost and Whitsuntide—and next Epiphany.—Some churches had a custom of baptizing on the anniversary of the dedication of the church; others made the festivals of the apostles and martyrs solemn seasons of baptizing; this latter custom however is censured by some canons, and cannot be regarded as an authentic practice of the Church.

There was no *apostolic* institution in regard to the time of baptism, and no such customs as above mentioned were observed in the earliest age of the Church. Baptism was then generally administered upon desire and profession without any delay—as the ministers might judge the subjects properly prepared. But as Christianity spread it was found expedient to proceed more slowly with the candidates—and to adopt some general rules for the better security of the purity of the Church.

But as these rules were founded upon expediency, so even in the times of their strictest observation, there were many cases in which they were dispensed with.

§ 143. *Place of Baptism.*

In the apostolic age, and for some time after, baptism was performed in rivers or any other suitable place. But after baptisteries were built adjoining to churches, rules were made forbidding that baptism should in ordinary cases be elsewhere performed. Men might have private oratories for prayer, but baptism was not to be

administered in private houses, nor anywhere but in the baptistery, except in extraordinary cases of sickness and the like, or with the special license of the bishop.

§ 144. *Renunciations and Professions made immediately before Baptism.*

When the candidates were come to the place of baptism and just before the rite was administered, they were required to make a solemn renunciation, which is given in the Apostolical Constitutions in these words: "I renounce Satan, and his works, and his pomps, and his service, and his angels, and his inventions and all things that belong to him, or that are subject to him."[1] Sometimes it was more concisely expressed as the renunciation of the devil and his works and the world.[2] Sometimes too, particular sins, callings, offices, &c., were specified by name.[3] This renunciation was a very ancient part of the things required of candidates at baptism; and is by some derived from apostolic institution. It was the custom to repeat it three times; which is by some thought to have had reference to the persons of the Trinity.

Next after the renunciation, the candidates made a solemn vow or covenant of obedience to Christ—giving themselves up to the government and conduct of Christ. Some have thought there was no such distinction between the renunciation and vow of obedience, as between distinct parts of the service. Some customs connected with them however show that it was so regarded. For it was the custom that the renunciation should be made by the candidate with his face turned to the *west*—as the place of darkness and symbolical of the abode of the "prince of darkness;" and also with gestures and marks of abhorrence and defiance, as stretching forth the clenched hand, or spitting.[4] Then the vow or covenant of obedience was made, the candidate turning to the *east*, as symbolical of the "Sun of righteousness," or as others say, as towards the paradise of God.[5] In some baptisteries there were distinct apartments where these two parts of the service were performed, as has been before noticed in speaking of these edifices.

---

[1] Const. Apost. lib. vii. cap. 41. [2] Cypr. Ep. 7. al 13. ad Rogat.—Hieron. Com. in Matt. v. 26. [3] Conc. Elib. can. 3. [4] Cyril. Catech. Mystag. 1. n. 2. [5] Hieron. in Amos. vi. 14.—Cyril. cat. 1. n. 6.—Basil. de Spir. St. cap. 27.

Connected with the vow of obedience, a profession of faith was also made in the words of the creed used in the Church for the instruction of catechumens, and answers given to such questions thereon as were propounded by the minister. This confession of faith was made in the most solemn manner—usually before many witnesses—the candidate standing with his face to the east—with his hands and eyes lifted up to heaven—and in some churches repeating it three times[1]—and, it is thought by some writers, finally subscribing it with his own hand.

The object of all these ceremonies and solemnities was to make a profound impression of the obligations assumed, and to secure a stedfast fidelity in the performance of them.[2]

§ 145. *Of Sponsors in Baptism.*

There were three sorts of sponsors in the primitive Church: 1. For children who could not answer for themselves; 2. For adult persons who by sickness or infirmity or other incapacity could not answer for themselves; 3. For all adult persons in general. The obligations of sponsors varied according to these distinctions. Those who were sponsors for children were obliged in the first place to make in behalf of the children all those renunciations and professions required, and secondly to become guardians of their Christian education. Parents were commonly the sponsors for their own children. But in cases where the parents could not or would not become sponsors, and others took upon them the office, they assumed only the obligations of answering for them at baptism and of taking care of their spiritual instruction; but not of their temporal support and maintenance—which in case they became destitute always fell upon the Church.[3]

The second sort of sponsors were for such adult persons as through sickness or infirmity could not answer for themselves. If they recovered so as to be able to understand what had been done, it was the sponsor's duty to inform them, and to induce them to assume and make good the obligations assumed for them. The third sort were for all adult persons in general. It was not their office to

---

[1] Cyril. lib. 12. in Joh. 21. [2] Chrysost. Hom. 21. ad Pop. Antioch. [3] August. Ep. 23. ad Bonifac.—Tertul. de Bapt. cap. 18.—August. Serm. 106. de Temp.

answer in the name of the baptized, but only to instruct and admonish them before and after baptism. Special qualifications were therefore desirable in such sponsors; and the office was usually performed by deacons, and deaconesses,[1] and sometimes by the sacred virgins—who with the deaconesses were sponsors in such cases only for women.

But one sponsor was anciently required—a man for a man, and a woman for a woman; and in the early Church there appears no prohibition of any sort of persons—of reputable standing in the Church—performing this office. The names of the sponsors were registered along with the baptized in the books of the Church, that it might be easier known what persons were under the weighty obligations of this office. There is no ground in the practice of the early Church for the Romish rule prohibiting the marriage of sponsors with their spiritual relations.

§ 146. *Of unction in Baptism.*

Some ancient writers speak of an unction made immediately before baptism. The Apostolical Constitutions describe it as used immediately after the confession of faith; Cyril of Jerusalem, as between the renunciation and confession.[2] No mention of this is made however by Justin Martyr, or Tertullian, so that the practice must have come in after their time. This unction is not to be confounded with that called *Chrism*, which was used in confirmation—and which will be hereafter spoken of. The significance of this ceremony of unction seems to be derived from the scriptural allusions to Christians as being grafted into the good olive and made partakers of its fatness,—or to the practice of anointing wrestlers for combat.[3] It was not essential to baptism.

§ 147. *The sign of the Cross used in Baptism.*

Candidates for baptism seem to have received the solemn ceremony of the sign of the cross made upon their foreheads, at their admission as catechumens, and again at the time of exorcism, and again at the time of unction before baptism, and finally at confirmation after baptism.

---

[1] Const. Apost. lib. iii. c. 16. [2] Const. Apost. lib. vii. cap. 41.—Cyril. cat. ii. n. 3. [3] Cyril. cat. ii. n. 8.—Ambros. de Sacram. i. c. 2.

§ 148. *Of the consecration of the water in Baptism.*

Immediately after the unction the minister proceeded to consecrate the water for baptism by invocation, or if the bishop were present, he performed it while the priests were finishing the unction. This consecration by prayer was used, not only in regard to the water for baptism, but also the oil for unction, and in the eucharist, and in giving imposition of hands.[1] This was regarded as the regular and orthodox practice, but not of absolute necessity to the essence of baptism. The sign of the cross was used in this consecration—as it was also in nearly all the solemn rites of the Church.[2]

There were set forms of prayer used in this service, though they were not uniformly in the same words—which was required to be the case in the form of baptism itself; for Augustine observes that the latter never varied, but the other was subject to errors and corruptions by reason of the liberty left to human composers. One of these forms is extant in the Apostolical Constitutions,[3] in which the priest commences with a thanksgiving, "blessing and praising the Lord God Almighty, the Father of the only begotten God, for that he sent his Son to be incarnate for us," &c.;—then follows an invocation to God "to look down from heaven and sanctify this water; give it grace and power, that he that is baptized therein, according to the command of God, may be crucified with him, and die with him, and be buried with him, and rise again with him to that adoption which comes by him; that dying unto sin, he may live unto righteousness." It may be remarked that this whole service as set down in that author has a great resemblance to the prayers in our baptismal service.

It may be observed that the effect of this consecration—like that in the eucharist—was held in the early Church not to be a change of *substance*, but only of *qualities and powers*, by the superaddition of spiritual and mystical virtues. This is what the ancient writers mean by *transelementation*—for the word *transubstantiation* was not known among them.[4]

[1] August. de bapt. lib. v. cap. 20. [2] August. Hom. 27.—Chrysost. Hom. 54 al 55. in Matt. [3] Lib. vii. cap. 43. [4] Optat. lib. iii. p. 32.—Cyril in John iii. 5.—Greg. Nyssen. de bapt. tom. iii. 369.

§ 149. *The different ways of baptizing—by immersion, clinic baptism, &c.*

There is no question but either of the ways of baptizing—by total immersion of the body, or by sprinkling—fully answer the end of the ordinance. But the primitive Christians thought that complete immersion represented in a more lively manner the burial and resurrection of Christ; and that the unclothing of the body better typified the putting off the body of sin, in order to put on the new man. Hence the practice was that persons baptized were divested of all clothing—as is apparent from a multitude of testimonies that either assert it in express terms, or mention it in such a manner as necessarily to imply it.[1] And this practice was so general that no exception was made either in regard to the tenderness of infants, or to women—save in cases of sickness or disability which made it necessary to vary from the usual custom.[2] Yet great care was taken so to order matters as not to violate decency—by having separate baptisteries for women, or by baptizing them at a different time from the men, and by employing the aid of the deaconesses to divest the women and so to order the whole service as might best comport with decency and the solemnity of the service.[3]

Thus divested the candidates were immersed in water. This custom is plainly referred to in several passages of the New Testament,[4] as well as in numerous passages of other early writers.[5] The reason of this is given by the council of Toledo, that "the immersion in water is as it were the descending into the grave, and the rising out of the water a resurrection,"[6]—and thus represents the death of the old man and the rising to life of the new. So in Ambrose.[7]

To this mode the Church adhered so strictly, even in respect to infants, that no deviation was made in ordinary cases. Two cases only of exception were made. 1. In sickness and extreme danger of life. Baptism by aspersion or sprinkling was then allowed. This

[1] Chrysost. Hom. vi. in Coloss.—Ambros. Serm. 10.—Cyril. Cat. Myst. ii. n. 2.—Zeno, Invitat. ii. ad bapt. Bibl. Pat. Vet. tom ii. p. 442. [2] Chrysost. Ep. ad Innocent. p. 680. [3] Epiphan. Hæres. 79.—Id. Expos. Fid. n. 21. [4] Rom. vi. 4.—Col. ii. 12, &c. [5] Const. Apost. lib. iii. c. 17.—Chrysost. Hom. 40 in 1 Cor. in Joh. iii. 5.—Cyril. cat. xvii. n. 8. [6] Conc. Tolet. iv. can. 5. [7] Ambros. de Sacram. lib. ii. c. 7.

was called clinic baptism, that is baptism upon a sick bed—and its lawfulness or validity was never disputed,[1]—although some councils prohibit such from clerical dignities in ordinary cases, and especially if through neglect baptism was deferred until extreme sickness and danger of death. 2. The other exception to the general rule was in cases where sufficient water for immersion could not be procured, as when a martyr in prison was to be baptized, or to baptize others.

§ 150. *Trine Immersion.*

The practice of the early Church was to immerse the body under the water three several times. Tertullian speaks of it as the general custom in his time; so Basil, Jerome, and others, some of whom say it was done at the distinct mention of each person of the blessed Trinity.[2] Two reasons were given for this practice, the one that it represented their profession of faith in the Holy Trinity, the other that it referred to the three days of Christ's burial. Augustine[3] joins both these reasons together.

This practice was derived by some from apostolical tradition; by others from its institution by our Saviour; by others it was thought to be an indifferent circumstance. Tertullian, Basil, and Jerome reckon it to have been handed down from apostolical tradition.[4] Chrysostom seems to think it prescribed in the Saviour's words of institution.[5] The Apostolical Canons order every minister to be deposed who should baptize otherwise.[6] Innovations were however after a time made in this respect, and controversies growing out of theological views arose concerning the practice, which at length led the council of Toledo to make rules to dispense with it; yet Strabo considers it to have been the prevalent practice of the Church till the seventh century; and Vossius speaks of trine immersion, or what corresponds to it—the trine aspersion, being the general practice of the modern Church.[7]

---

[1] Cyr. Ep. 76 al 69 ad Magnum. [2] Tertul. contr. Prax. c. 26.—Basil, de Spir. St. c. 27. Hieron. adv. Lucif. c. iv. Ambros. de Sacram. lib. ii. c. 7. [3] August. Hom. iii. ap. Gratian. de Consecrat. Dis. iv. cap. 78. [4] Tertull. de Coron. c. iii. Basil de Sp. Sanct. c. 27. Hieron. contr. Lucif. c. 4. [5] Chrysost. Hom. de fide. tom. vii. p. 290. Ed. Savil. [6] Can. Apost. 49. al 50. [7] Strabo de Offic. Eccl. cap. 26. Vossius de Bapt. Disp. ii.

CHAPTER SECOND.

OF CONFIRMATION AND OTHER CEREMONIES SUBSEQUENT TO BAPTISM AND PREVIOUS TO ADMISSION TO THE EUCHARIST.

§ 151. *Time of Confirmation immediately after Baptism.*

As soon as baptism was performed, the subjects of it were immediately brought to the bishop, if he was present, to receive his benediction with prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon them. With this prayer was joined *imposition of hands*, (Χειροθεσία), and usually also a second unction called *Chrism* (Χρίσμα), and the sign of the Cross, (Σφραγίς), *the seal of the Lord*. The rite is more frequently mentioned in the ancient writers by one or the other of the above names, than by that of *confirmation*.

If the bishop were present, confirmation always immediately followed baptism. So says Tertullian: "as soon as they came out of the water, they were annointed with the oil of consecration, and then received imposition of hands, inviting down the Holy Spirit by that benediction."[1] To the same effect Cyril of Jerusalem, the Apostolic Constitutions, Ambrose, Optatus, and other writers.[2] It was accordingly administered to infants as well as to adults—which is clear from various passages of ancient writers, as well as from the custom which prevailed for several centuries in the Church, of giving the eucharist to infants—the participation of which by the ordinary rules of the Church was always to be preceeded by confirmation.[3]

Hence it would appear that the ancients did not regard confirmation as a sacrament distinct from baptism in the strict and Romish sense of the word sacrament, but rather as connected with and forming the complement of baptism.[4] It is indeed true that the word sacrament is frequently used in a large and loose sense by the ancient writers as signifying any solemn religious rite, as well as in the strict sense, which the word *mystery* was more appropriate to

---

[1] Tertul. de Bapt. Cap. 7. [2] Cyril. Cat. Myst. iii. n. 1. Const. Apost. lib. vii. cap. 43, 44. Ambros. de Sacram. lib. iii. c. 2. Optat. lib. iv. p. 81. [3] Genadius, de Dogmat. Eccles. cap. iii. August. Tract. vi. in 1 Joh. ii. Bp. Taylor's Worthy Commun. ch. iii. § 2. Dallæ de Confirm. lib. iii. cap. 13. [4] Cypr. Ep. 72 ad Stepham. Optat. lib. iv. p. 81.

express. In this latter sense baptism and confirmation were considered as different rites of the same sacrament—even in cases where confirmation followed baptism after an interval of years, as when it was administered to heretics and schismatics to supply defects of irregular baptism, &c.

In the ancient Church, as has been said, the ordinary rule was that baptism should always be immediattely followed by confirmation. But when the bishop could not be present, confirmation was deferred till he could have opportunity to perform it. Hence Jerome speaks of it as the established custom for the bishops to visit the churches of their bishoprics for this purpose; and to prevent the evils of delay, some canons obliged the bishops to visit all their churches once a year, and if their dioceses were too large for this, ordered that they should be divided.[1]

In regard to the difference between the ancient and modern practice respecting the time of confirmation, it may be remarked that in the ancient Church the essence of the rite consisted in the invocation of the Holy Spirit to descend upon the baptized person,—while in the modern Church it is also regarded as a completion and perfection of the vows and professions made in baptism, by the personal assumption of them on the part of the baptized person, and therefore is deferred till he has come of age to understand and take them upon himself.

§ 152. *The minister of Confirmation.*

The great diversity of rules and customs in the ancient Church in regard to this subject, have relation to the different parts of the ceremony—to ordinary and extraordinary occasions—and to different churches.

The *consecration* of the oil for chrism was the exclusive office of the bishop. The second council of Carthage forbids presbyters to do it, and refers to a former council that had made the like prohibition.[2] Various other councils to the same effect.

In regard to the *use and application* of the holy oil, the practice of different churches was various. Some churches, as the Roman,

---

[1] Hieron. contr. Lucif. cap. 4. Conc. Eliber. can. 77. Conc. Lucens, Conc. tom. v. p. 874. [2] Conc. Carth. ii. can. 3.

divided the office between the bishop and presbyters.[1] In others, as the French churches, it was performed wholly by the presbyters.[2] In others, as the Eastern churches, not only the consecration of the oil, but its use, whenever he was present, was reserved exclusively to the bishop; and presbyters were allowed to use it only in his absence and in extraordinary cases.[3]

The other ceremony—that of *imposition of hands*—was more universally and strictly reserved to the bishops. Thus Cyprian speaks of it as the ordinary office of bishops; so likewise Firmilian bishop of Cæsarea a cotemporary with Cyprian.[4] The author on the baptism of heretics, at the end of Cyprian's works, says: "if the bishops were present at baptism, they gave the imposition of hands with baptism; but if any were baptized by inferior clergy in time of necessity, then the bishops supplied it afterwards, or else the Lord supplied it as he saw fit."[5] The council of Eliberis made two canons ordering, when baptism was performed in certain cases of the absence of the bishop, the subjects should be afterwards brought to the bishop that the baptism might be perfected by imposition of hands.[6] And we have seen from Jerome that the bishops visited the churches of their dioceses for the purpose of confirmation.

Yet there were some special cases in which presbyters by commission from their bishop might give imposition of hands; as when specially directed in particular cases, whether in the presence or absence of the bishop; and also when entrusted with a general commission to do so in case of persons in danger of death. The bishop's commission was sometimes given to presbyters to perform this rite in the case of energumens after baptism—also of those who had been baptized in heresy or schism, if in danger of death. In such cases presbyters were regarded as the bishop's special agents acting by authority solely vested in him.[7]

§ 153. *The manner of administering confirmation.*

The first ceremony of confirmation was the *unction or chrism.* The origin of this custom is obscure. Bp. Pearson thinks it came

---

[1] Innocent. Ep. I. ad Decent. c. iii. Greg. Ep. ix. lib. iii. [2] Conc. Arusic. I. can. 1. [3] Const. Apost. lib. iii. cap. 16. [4] Cypr. Ep. 73. ad Jubaian. Firmil. Ep. 75, ap. Cypr. [5] Anon. de Bapt. Hæret. ap. Cypr. p. 23. [6] Conc. Eliber. can. 38. and 77. [7] Martin. Bracar. Collect. can. 52.—Innocent. Ep. I. ad Decent. cap. vi.—Conc. Arausican. I. can. 2.

into the Church shortly after the times of the apostles.[1] Basnage and Daille think not until the third century, when it is first mentioned by Origen and Tertullian.[2] The latter seems the more probable opinion. Whenever admitted it soon came to be greatly accounted of. It was regarded as the symbol and means of the spiritual anointing of Christians to the royal priesthood of God's people.[3] It was performed with certain forms of prayer; and the holy oil which had been previously consecrated was applied not only to the forehead but to other parts of the body. The second ceremony of confirmation was the *sign of the cross*, connected with the former.

After this was the third and most material part of the ceremony, the *imposition of hands*, with which was joined, fourthly, a solemn prayer of invocation for the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the subject of the rite. The antiquity of these latter parts of the rite is by all ancient writers carried as high as the apostles, and deduced from their example, Acts viii. Acts xix. Heb. vi. 2. &c. So Cyprian, Jerome, and Augustine.[4]

§ 154. *Importance attached to it in the early Church.*

The early Church thought very highly of the rite of confirmation as the appointed means of conveying spiritual strength and the grace of steadfastness; just as baptism was the means of the grace of regeneration and forgiveness. The neglect of it was therefore censured, and some councils had canons excluding from sacred orders those who had been guilty of this neglect.[5]

§ 155. *Remaining ceremonies of baptism following confirmation.*

The newly baptized, either at the time of confirmation or immediately after it, were clothed in white garments, in token of their new purity, as *the white flock of Christ*,—*Grex Christi candidus*—to use the language sometimes applied to them.[6] These were sometimes delivered to them with a solemn form of words,[7] and were

---

[1] Pearson, Lect. in Act. V. [2] Basnage, Crit. in Baron. p. 76.—Daill. de confirm. lib. ii. cap. 2.—Origen. in Levit. Hom. 9. [3] Origen. ut supra.—Hieron. contr. Lucif. cap. 2. [4] Cypr. Ep. 73. ad Jubaian.—Hieron. contr. Lucif. cap. 4.—August. de Trin. lib. xv. c. 26. Id. de Bapt. lib. iii. cap. 16. [5] Conc. Neocæs. can. 12. conc. Eliber. can. 38. [6] Lactant. Carm. de Resur. Dom.—Cyril. cat. myst. iv. n. 2. [7] Gregor. Sacrament. de Bapt.

commonly worn eight days, and then hung up and carefully preserved in the vestries of the church as evidence against the parties if they violated their engagements.[1]

To this was added, though not so universally, the ceremony of the confirmed carrying lighted candles or lamps in their hands—in reference to the parable of the virgins going forth to meet the bridegroom,—or to the Saviour's precept "so let your light shine," &c.[2]

Another ceremony observed in regard to the newly baptized was the giving them the kiss of peace upon their incorporation into the Church of Christ—either as a token of Christian affection, or as denoting their reconciliation to God and his favor.[3]

It was the custom also to give the newly confirmed a little honey and milk to taste in token of their new birth.[4]

They were then required to say the Lord's Prayer, standing upright, and another short form of prayer is given in the Apostolical Constitutions, which they were to say in these words: "Almighty God, Father of Christ, thy only bgotten Son, give me an immaculate body, a pure heart, a watchful soul, an unerring knowledge, with the influence of the Holy Ghost, that I may possess and enjoy the fulness of the truth, through thy Christ, by whom all glory be to Thee in the Holy Ghost forever. Amen."[5] Gregory Nazianzen also mentions that they were received by the Church with sacred hymns and psalmody, in token and prelude of the praises which it was to be their employment to sing in the life to come.[6]—There is one other ceremony mentioned, which was used in some churches and rejected in others—that of washing the feet of the newly baptized.[7]

As soon as the ceremonies of baptism and confirmation were ended the candidates were immediately admitted to partake the eucharist—which was hence called the *consummation* or *perfection* of the Christian.

---

[1] Victor. de Persec. Vandal. lib. iii. Bibl. Pat. t. vii. p. 613. [2] Greg. Naz. Orat. 40. de Bapt. [3] Cypr. 59. al 64. ad Fidrem.—August. contr. Epist. Pelag. lib. iv. cap, 8. [4] Hieron. contr. Lucif. cap. 4.—Tertull. de Coron. cap. 3. [5] Const. Apost. lib. vii. cap. 44, 45. [6] Greg. Naz. Orat. 40. de Bapt. [7] August. Ep. 119. ad Januar. cap. 18.

BOOK FIFTH.

CHAPTER FIRST.

OF DIVINE SERVICE IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH: GENERAL OBSERVATIONS RELATING TO IT.

§ 156. *All orders of persons not admitted to the whole service of the Church.*

Having seen the way of introducing men into the Christian Church through catecumenship, baptism and confirmation, we may now consider the manner of public worship, and the various offices of divine service. And inasmuch as none but the baptized and confirmed, that is, the faithful in the stricter sense, were permitted to be present at the whole service, it will be best first to consider that part of the service at which all orders of persons were admitted to be present. This was called the *Missa Catechumenorum*, or *service of the Catechumens*. Then followed the *Missa Fidelium*, or *service of the faithful*, from which all were excluded but the baptized, who were also called *communicants*. These two parts of divine service may therefore be termed, the ante-communion service, and the communion service.

§ 157. *Of the Missa Catechumenorum, and Missa Fidelium, or ancient Ante-communion, and Communion service.*

The ante-communion service of the ancient Church comprehended all that part of the service which preceded the common prayers of the communicants at the altar. It comprised therefore the psalmody, the reading of the Scripture lessons, the homily or sermon, and the particular prayers that were made over the catechumens, penitents, energumens, &c., before they were dismissed. The psalms, lessons, sermon, &c., of this part of the service were designed not only for the instruction of the communicants, but also of the catechumens, and heathen, and unbelievers, and heretics. Some canons also order that the catechumens be permitted to tarry to hear the reading of the Gospel; others allow this also to heretics and heathen, and to

this end order that the Gospel be read before the oblation is brought forth.[1] According to such an arrangement not only all the catechumens, but also unbelievers, heretics and heathen, were permitted to be present during all that part of the service which corresponds in general to the whole morning service of the Church in this country when there is no communion—that is, to the morning prayer, the ante-communion service, and the sermon.

After the sermon it was usual for the deacon to call out: "*let none that are only hearers, let none of the unbelievers, be present.*"[2] Such then departed. Then followed the prayers for those catechumens who belonged to the class called *prostrators;* and after their dismission, prayers for the *energumens;* after that, prayers for the candidates for baptism; and last of all, prayers for the penitents. This brought the *Missa Catechumenorum* or ancient ante-communion service to a close.

After this was ended, the deacon made another solemn proclamation to all non-communicants (οἱ ἀκοινώνητοι) to withdraw; or as the Constitutions have it: "let no catechumen be present, no hearer, no infidel, no heterodox or heretical person."[3] Then commenced the *missa fidelium*, the *service of the faithful*, or *communion-service*. Both these parts ot divine service will be more particularly described in another place. It is proper first to notice some things of a more general nature.

§ 158. *Appellations given to divine service.*

The word *Missa* (*Mass*), has already been used. It is proper to remark that in the ancient Church it was never taken in the Romish sense, to signify the consecrating of the bread and wine into the body of Christ and offering it as an expiatory sacrifice; but was applied to every part of divine service. The word was taken from the solemn *dismissions* pronounced at the close of several parts of the service to various sorts of persons.[4]

Sacraficium. Every part of divine service was metaphorically

---

[1] Conc. Carth. iv. can. 84.—Conc. Arausican. I. can. 18.—Conc. Valentin. can. 1.—Chrysost. Hom. 41. de Pelag. Hom. 1. in Matt. 27. &c. [2] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 5. [3] Idem. lib. viii. cap. 12. [4] Cassian. Instit. lib. ii. cap. 13. lib. iii. cap. 5, 6.—Conc. Agathen. can. 30.—Mabil. de Cursu. Gallic. lib. ii. p. 107.

called by this name, as coming instead of the sacrifices of the Jewish dispensation. Thus Clemens Alexandrinus says, "the sacrifices of Christians are their prayers and praises, and reading of the Scriptures, and psalms and hymns before meals," &c.[1] To the same effect many other ancient writers[2]—and there is nothing to countenance the exclusive appropriation or peculiar application of the word to the eucharist.

Sacramenta. This word is not so ancient or so common as the former. It was often used in a larger sense than the Greek word *mystery*, which answers to what we now call *sacrament*. In this larger sense it denoted not only all sacred rites which have anything symbolical, but also the method of performing divine service in general, whether sacraments properly so called, or any other parts of the service.[3]

Cursus Ecclesiasticus. These offices of divine service were also called the *Cursus Ecclesiasticus*—the order or course of divine worship.

Among the Greek writers the above names are seldom met with —the general names with them for the offices and course of public service are Λειτουργία, *liturgy*, Ἱερουργία, *sacred service*.[4]

The word liturgy not only denoted the offices of divine service, but also was used for the books containing the directions for performing it, and the set forms of prayer, thanksgiving, &c. So the Apostolical Constitutions[5]—which also uses the word διατάξεις, *the order*, in the same sense. In the same sense too the Latins used the words *cursus*, *ordo*, *officium*.

The word *litany* was at first a general term for prayers, and not appropriated as afterwards to that particular sort called among the Latins *rogations*—a special kind of supplications and deprecations.

§ 159. *Object of ancient religious worship: God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but no creature, angel or saint.*

It is sufficient for the plan and purpose of this work to declare the fact that the worship of the primitive Church fully recognized

---

[1] Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. p. 860. [2] Hieron. Ep. 7. ad Lætam.—Hilar. in Ps. 140.—Euseb. ad Constant. Orat. p. 659. [3] Menard. Not. in Greg. Sacrament. p. 1. [4] Conc. Ephes. Ep. Synod. ap. Causobon. Justin. Novell. vii. [5] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 6.

the doctrine of the sacred Trinity, and that divine homage was given to each person of the Trinity. A full and particular statement of the proofs of this is more appropriate to a history of theological doctrines.[1] It may be observed in general that the ancient forms of devotion, liturgies and fragments of liturgies, scattered throughout the writers of the first three centuries, abound in regular doxologies, and in supplications, praises and thanksgivings addressed to the Trinity, and to Christ, and to the Holy Ghost.

It is also clear that the primitive Church held, that religious worship should be paid to God alone, and not to any idol or creature. Innumerable passages might be adduced to this effect. A few are referred to.[2] In particular they rejected in express terms the worship of angels and saints as unlawful and idolatrous.[3] Not to multiply here citations from the passages referred to, and from the numerous others to which reference might be made, a single one from those made to Origen's book against the heathen Celsus may be interesting, as containing a line of argument perfectly applicable to the ground of the Romish practice of invoking angels and saints: "allowing what Celsus says to be true, that the angels were God's heralds and heavenly messengers; yet still the heralds and messengers are not to be worshipped, but He, whose heralds and messengers they are." To the same effect a passage may be adduced from the author under the name of Ambrose, where condemning the invocation of saints and angels he says: "men are wont when they are ashamed of their neglect of God, to use this miserable excuse, that by these [angels and saints] they may go to God, as by officers we go to the king. * * But to obtain the favour of God, from whom nothing is hid, for he knows the merits of all, we have no need of an advocate or spokesman, but only a devout mind."[4]

---

[1] The passages upon this point from the ancient authors in chronological order have been collected and set forth by Bingham, Chr. Antiq. B. xiii. ch. ii. [2] Justin. Mart. Apol. 1. p. 63.—Theoph. ad Autolyc. lib. 1. p. 30.—Tertull. apol. cap. 30.—Acta Fructuosi, ap. Baron. an. 262.—Dionys. Ep. ap. Euseb. lib. vii. c. 11.—Iren. lib. v. c. 22.—Clem. Alex. Strom. vi.—Origen. contr. Cels. lib. ii. lib. viii, et passim. Cypr. Ep. 66. &c. &c. [3] Martyr. Polycarp. ap. Euseb. iv. c. 15.—Acta Fructuosi. ap. Baron. an. 262.—August. Serm. 101. de Diversis.—Origen, contr. Cels. lib. v. p. 233, 239. lib. viii, p. 400, 416, 420. [4] Ambros. in Rom. 1.

The doctrine and practice of the Church on this subject are also abundantly attested by Augustine in his book on True Religion.[1]

It is true indeed that about this time the Manichees began to charge the Catholic Christians with worshipping their martyred saints. Faustus objected to them that they only exchanged heathen idol-worship for the worship of martyrs. But a clear proof that this kind of corruption had not yet crept into the Church is found in Augustine, who indignantly repels the charge as utterly false—admitting that while the memory of the martyrs was cherished, and in many cases their anniversaries celebrated, yet no religious worship was ever paid but to God alone.[2]

Finally, not only did the primitive Church reject and condemn the practice of worshipping or invoking angels and saints, but charged it upon the heretics as an unlawful and sinful practice.[3] For there were some heretics who invoked angels from the earliest times of the Church. And because the practice might pervert the orthodox—having in it a "show of humility," the council of Laodicea has a canon declaring that Christians ought not to forsake the Church of God and go aside and hold conventicles, and invocate the names of angels, which things are forbidden, &c.[4] The Romanists have corrupted this canon in translating it; but the fraud is palpable; nor in the whole compass of the authentic documents of the Catholic Church is there anything to justify the corrupt doctrines and practices of the Romanists in regard to this subject.

§ 160. *Divine service always performed in the vernacular tongue.*

This was the universal practice of the primitive Church. This is evident from various sources of proof. In the first place it is expressly or in effect so declared by all the early writers that speak of the subject. "The Greeks" says Origen, "use the Greek language in their prayers, the Romans the Roman, and so every one in his own dialect prays to God, &c."[5] To the same effect, Justin Mar-

---

[1] Aug. de vera Relig. t. 1. cap. 55. [2] August. contr. Faust. lib. xxi. cap. 20. [3] Chrysost. Hom. v. in Coloss. &c.—Aug. de Hæres. cap. 39.—Isodor. Origen. lib. viii. cap. 5.—Iren. lib. ii. cap. 57 Tertull. de Præscr. cap. 33. [4] Conc. Load. can. 35. The Romanists have corrupted the Latin version of this canon by reading "*angulos*" *corners*, instead of "*angelos*," *angels*; but a reference to the Greek instantly shows the fraud. [5] Origen, contr. Cels. lib. viii.

tyr, Jerome, and others.[1] The same thing is evident from the people joining in the psalmody and making responses[2]—from the frequent exhortations of the ancient writers to the people to hear, read, and pray, with understanding[3]—from the references made by the Fathers in their sermons to the prayers and lessons—from the translation of the Scriptures into all languages whither the Gospel was carried—from the office of interpreters in churches where from the nature of the case the congregation was composed of persons not all able to understand one language—and from various other matters of custom and practice in the Church.

§ 161. *Of Liturgies, or set forms of prayer.*

In regard to the question, whether there were set forms, as well as a regular order, of public service, the distinction should be borne in mind between such forms as were of divine appointment and such as were of ecclesiastical or human institution; and also between ordinary and extraordinary services. On the first point, there can be no doubt that the divinely appointed forms, as the form of baptism, the Lord's prayer, the singing of David's Psalms, the apostolic forms of benediction, were uniformly observed. As to the of forms human composition they were added by the bishops and governors of the Church according to their best judgment, and were intended for the ordinary service; for upon extraordinary occasions liberty to compose new forms was left to every one. The practice of setting forth a liturgy for the ordinary service of the Church came in upon the cessation of the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit. As a reason why we have none of the earliest liturgies remaining entire and perfect, it may be mentioned that for several centuries every bishop had the power to order and set forth the liturgy to be used in his own diocese. And when any new bishopric was erected by division of an old one, the newly formed diocese was not obliged to adhere to the liturgy of the old one; as we see from Sozomen, when Maiuma in Palestine was erected into a bishopric by dividing the diocese of Gaza.[4] These liturgies would not therefore be likely to be preserved entire in any of the records and documents of the gene-

[1] Just. Apol. ii. p. 98.—Hieron. Epitaph. Paulæ.—Cypr. Vit. Cæsar. Arelat. [2] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 6.—Basil. Ep. 63. [3] Basil. Hom. in Ps. 28. [4] Sozom. lib. v. cap. 3.

ral Church, and have perished along with the archives of all the particular churches, except as fragments of them may be incidentally found in the writings that have survived. Enough of these however remain to show the practice of the Church in using set liturgies in the earliest times.

In after ages the bishops of a whole province conformed by consent to the liturgy of the metropolitan. It was afterwards enacted by several provincial councils that the order of service and the liturgy should be uniform. The first canon to this effect is one of the council of Agde, in France, about the year 506. Shortly after this period similar enactments were made by councils for various provinces.[1] Out of this in process of time and with the progress of political changes, grew national liturgies.

§ 162. *Concerning the use of forms of prayer in the apostolic age.*

Nothing can be clearly decided on this point beyond the consent of all the ancient writers, that the Lord's prayer was in general use as a part of public service from the earliest days of the Church—that the form of baptism was uniformly the same—that there was a settled form in every church for the profession of faith;—and probably also the Scripture forms of psalms and hymns, and the forms of benediction. Inasmuch however as there was a settled order of divine service in the Jewish church, to which undoubtedly the Saviour himself conformed; and as he himself gave a specimen of a form of prayer which was held in reverence and used by the earliest Christians; it cannot in any way be fairly argued that forms of public worship are at variance with the genius of Christianity, or that the apostles and primitive Christians would be unlikely to use them. The probability is in favour of the opposite opinion.

§ 163. *The use of Liturgies in the second century.*

Ignatius is said by the ancient historians to have brought the practice of alternate singing of hymns into the Church of Antioch, at the beginning of the second century.[2] The ancient author who wrote in the second century as quoted in Eusebius, has an argument for

---

[1] Conc. Agath. can. 30.—Conc. Epaunens. c. 27.—Conc. Venetic. can. 15.—Conc. Gerundens. c. 1.—Conc. Tolet. iv. c. 2.—Conc. Bracar. 1. c. 19. [2] Socr. lib. vi. cap. 8.

the divinity of Christ from the hymns which were recited in the public service of the Church alternately by the ministers and people.[1] This clearly shows that precomposed forms at this time made a part of the public service of the Church, and renders it not unlikely that they were parts of a more complete composed service. In this view we may interpret the passage of Ignatius himself in which he exhorts the Magnesians to do nothing without the bishops and presbyters, "nor attempt anything seemingly agreeable to their own private fancies, but when they met together, to have one prayer, and one supplication.[2] This indeed, when taken by itself, is equally applicable, on supposition of an extempore prayer offered by the minister and silently joined in by the people; but when taken with other evidences, going to show that throughout the service the people also had their parts to perform in various responses and other forms, is in favour of a different supposition. Shortly after the time of Ignatius, Lucian, the heathen, writes in one of his dialogues, that coming into one of the Christian assemblies he heard that prayer beginning with the Father, and ending with the hymn of many names.[3] By the prayer beginning with the Father he probably refers to the Lord's prayer, and by the hymn of many names, to the greater doxology or *Gloria in Excelsis.* The Apostolical Constitutions speak of the responses of the people in certain set places, and Clemens Alexandrinus of the people praying with "*one common voice.*"[4] To the same effect many passages of Tertullian, all indicating a regular order of service and set forms of expression which are of the same sort as those known to have been at a subsequent period a regular part of the established liturgies.[5]

§ 164. *Use of Liturgies in the third century.*

Origen flourished in the early part of the third century. He was born in the year 185 and died in the year 254. In one of his homilies he expressly cites one of the forms of prayer used in the Church; and in another work in answer to a malicious objection of Celsus against the prayers contained in the service books of Christians, he

---

[1] Euseb. lib. v. cap. 28. [2] Ignat. Ep. ad Magnes. n. 7. [3] Luc. Philopatris. [4] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 12.—Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. cap. 6. [5] Tertull. de Bapt. cap. 13. de Coron. Mil. cap. 3, 13. de Jejun. 13. de Anima. 9. Apol. 39 de Spectac. 25.

admits the fact that Christians "used the ordered and prescribed prayers as became them," but repels the malignant falsehood of the charge brought against those prayers by Celsus.[1] The writings of Cyprian contain incidental references to the same effect.[2] And finally the Apostolical Constitutions has a whole book setting forth the order and forms of public service.

§ 165. *Use of Liturgies in the fourth century.*

It is not needful to go over the evidences of a set liturgy after the third century, as the traces become more and more distinct. A glance may be given at some parts of the evidence, as going to confirm the impression of the prior establishment of this practice. Thus Arnobius in the beginning of this century speaks of the public service of the Church and says it was the *settled practice* of Christians that they all prostrated themselves before God adoring him with audible voice, and joint supplications, or rather, as the original (*collatis precibus*) may be rendered, with digested and pre-composed forms of prayer. And he gives the general heads of the prayers which correspond with the order afterwards well known and established.[3] In the writings of Eusebius and Athanasius are abundant traces of the use of pre-conceived forms;[4] so in those of Cyril of Jerusalem, we find many forms in which the minister and the people alternately made supplications—corresponding to our litany and suffrages, versicles, &c.[5]

The council of Laodicea—which by some is placed in the year 319, and by others in the year 365—has in several canons prescribed the whole order of divine service at large, assigning the places where all the various prayers shall come in; and though the exact forms of prayers are not set down, yet the way in which they are spoken of in directing their use, plainly implies that certain forms were extant and well known as used in the service of the Church.[6] The eighth book of the Apostolical Constitutions which contains a collection of these forms, is frequently referred to by

[1] Origen. Hom. xi. in Jer.—Id. contr. Cels. lib. vi. p. 302. [2] Cypr. de Lapsis. p. 125. de Orat. Dom. p. 141. Ep. 8 al. 11. ad Cler. Orat. Dom. p. 152. [3] Arnob. lib. 1. p. 24 [4] Euseb. de Vit. Constant. lib. iv. cap. 19. 20. 17.—Hist. lib. ii. cap. 17.—Athanas. Apol .p. 672. &c. [5] Cyril. cat. 1. n. 2. 6. ii. 3, 4. iii. 2, 3. v. 1. 2. 3. [6] Conc. Laod. can. 7, 15, 17, 18, 19.

Epiphanius as an authority on this subject; he also has many other things in his writings in proof of the use of set forms.[1] To the same effect Optatus,[2] and particularly Basil, who composed a liturgy that came into very extensive use, and is referred to by one council and by many ancient writers.[3]

The writings of Augustine and Chrysostom abound with passages bearing upon this point. From the works of the former, Bingham says almost the whole of the liturgy of the African churches may be collected—showing a settled order and regular forms for the psalmody, the reading of the Scriptures, the prayers by the bishop, and the offices repeated by the deacons. Several African councils were held during the life of Cyprian, which made canons respecting public worship and the order and forms of prayer and divine service.[4] Bingham has made copious collections, out of the voluminous works of Chrysostom, of fragments of the ancient liturgy, which it would take up too much room to attempt any particular account of in this work.[5]

§ 166. *Use of the Lord's Prayer.*

It may not be out of keeping as interesting in itself, and as illustrating the practice of forms of prayer, to remark upon the high estimation and eminent use of the Lord's prayer among all the ancient Christians. Augustine says "that as the Church always used this prayer, so she used it upon the ground of the command of Christ."[6] Accordingly it was always used by the Church in all her public offices, there being no considerable office of which it did not form a part. We find it set down as a part of the prescribed form of the baptismal service;[7] of the communion service;[8] and of the daily morning and evening service of the Church distinct from the communion service.[9] The daily use of it is also prescribed as the duty of Christians in their private devotions.[10]

---

[1] Eiphan. Hær. 70. Expos. Fid. n. 22. tom. i.—Ep. ad Joh. Hierosol. tom. ii. p. 313. [2] Optat. lib. ii. p. 47. 53. 57. [3] Conc. Trull. can. 32.—Petr. Diac. de Incarn. inter Fulgentii opp. c. viii. p. 633.—Prelus, de Trad. Div. Litur. ap. Comber, Liturg. 168.—Leont. contr. Nestor. lib. iii. Bibl. Pat. tom. iv. [4] Conc. Carth. iii. can. 23.—Cod. Afric. can. 108. [5] Bingham's Antiq. of the Christ. Church. B. xiii. chap. 6. [6] August. Hom. 29. de Verbis Apost. [7] Const. Apost. lib. vii. cap. 44. [8] August. Hom. 83. de Diversis.—Ep. 59. ad Paulin. —Cyril. Cat. v. p. 298. &c. [9] Conc. Gerund. can 10.—Tolet. iv. can. 9. [10] Const. Apost. lib. vii. cap. 24.

§ 167. *Of sacred vestments, in divine worship.*

Of these things it may be observed in general that as they are in their nature non-essential, so the Church used her liberty in regard to the appointment of them. There is no certain evidence for particular prescriptions made, or particular observances practised, during the Apostolic or two following ages. Yet as in the succeeding time, when the Church was left in peace, very particular rules were practised, being in their general substance conformable to the customs and usages now observed in the Church, and as these rules are agreeable to the analogy of other known prescriptions of the early Church, and grounded in the same regard to the principles of human nature, it is altogether fair to presume that they had obtained very early in the practice of the Church, and long before the time when we meet with the first decisive and particular description of them, in the writings of the fourth century. It may therefore be well to adduce some of the testimonies of the writers of this period. In the beginning of the fourth century we find the use of sacred vestments, or peculiar habits appropriated to divine service, spoken of as a custom. For Constantine is said to have given a robe to the Bishop of Jerusalem to be worn in administering baptism.[1] Athanasius was accused by his enemies for laying a tax to procure linen vestments for the Church—where the point of the charge was the imposing the tax, and not the use; which shows the custom was to use such vestments in divine service at that time.[2] Jerome often mentions the sacred habit, as for instance in his book against Pelagius, he speaks of the clergy "coming forth in a white vestment, when they celebrate the sacraments."[3] So in his epitaph upon Nepotian, he says, Nepotian for ordinary wearing used the *pallium* or cloak, the ordinary dress of the Christian philosophers, but in his ministrations a white tunicle.[4] To the same effect Sozomen speaking of an assault made upon a church, says "the priests and deacons were beaten and driven out of the church as they were in the vestments of their ministration."[5] The council of Laodicea has two

[1] Theod. lib. ii. cap. 27. [2] Athan. Apol. ii. p. 778.—Sozom. lib. ii. cap. 22. [3] Hieron. lib. 1. contr. Pelag. [4] Idem. Ep. 3. ad Heliodor. [5] Sozom. lib. ii. cap. 21.

canons concerning the *Orarium*, a sort of scarf worn upon the shoulders by bishops, priests and deacons, but expressly forbidden by this council to the inferior orders.[1] The fourth council of Carthage speaks of the *Alba*, or *surplice*, which the deacon is ordered to wear at the oblation, and at the reading of the lessons.[2] The council of Narbo mentions the same.[3] The first council of Braga speaks of the surplice and scarf as both belonging to deacons, and the third council of Braga orders the scarf to be worn over both shoulders by the priests to distinguish him from the deacon who was to wear it on the left shoulder.[4]

§ 168. *Of the Postures used in Divine Worship.*

There were four sorts of postures allowed in the Church—standing, kneeling, bowing, and prostration. It was the general custom to *stand* in the performance of the whole of divine worship on the Lord's day, and during the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost —in memorial of the resurrection. This custom is by Irenæus derived from apostolical authority. Justin Martyr says that "as we ought to remember our fall by sin, and the grace of Christ by which we rise again from our fall, therefore we pray *kneeling* the six days as a symbol of our fall by sin, but not kneeling on the Lord's day, as a symbol of the resurrection, &c."[5] Turtullian speaks of the same practice grounded on the same tradition,[6]—as also Clemens Alexandrinus,[7] and Peter of Alexandria. The latter says "we keep the Lord's day as a festival of joy, because our Lord then rose from the dead, and our custom is not to kneel on that day."[8] In order to put an end to some disagreement of practice on this point, the council of Nice has a canon ordering that prayers be made standing on the Lord's day.[9] Various other writers to the same effect might be adduced. To this custom there was in the general practice no exception save in relation to penitents—those who doing penance for scandalous offences, were never allowed the privilege of standing.[10]

Except on the Lord's day and and the festival days from Easter to

---

[1] Conc. Laod. can. 22, 23. [2] Conc. Carth. iv. can. 41. [3] Conc. Narbon. can. 12. [4] Conc. Bracar. I. can. 27. III. can. 3. [5] Just. Quæst. et Respons. q. 115. [6] Tertull. de Coron. Mil. cap. iii. [7] Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. p. 854. [8] Pet. Alex. can. xv. [9] Conc. Nic. can. 20. [10] Conc. Carth. iv. can. 18.

Pentecost, as above mentioned, the most common posture was kneeling. This was the case in the daily morning and evening service, and particularly the service of the *stationary* or fast-days; though it it is to be observed there were even on these days certain prayers, as well as other parts of the service, which were still performed standing—the difference between these days and the Lord's day being that in the latter case all the service was performed standing. And it was the office and custom of the deacons to indicate these changes of posture by saying to the people before the several parts of the service: "let us stand upright reverently," or, "let us bend the knee."[1]

Another posture of devotion was *bowing* down the head. This was chiefly used in receiving the bishop's or priest's benediction, and in all the forms of invocation made to God in behalf of certain classes of persons present. This the Apostolical Constitutions direct the catechumens and energumens, to do at such times; so likewise the candidates for baptism and penitents are directed after the deacon's prayer to rise up and bow down their heads to receive the bishop's benediction.[2]

The only remaining posture that need be mentioned was that of prostration, or lying with the whole body on the ground. This posture seems only to have been used in extraordinary humiliation. Thus some lapsers, when they sued for admission to penance, prostrated themselves, begging for the prayers of the faithful.[3] Sitting was never an allowed posture of devotion in the Church, and some peculiar fancies about it are condemned by Tertullian, as well as some other superstitious customs of individuals, such as putting off their cloaks, washing the whole body, &c.[4]

As to the rest the ancient Church required the observance of all those customs which a decent propriety dictated. They insisted that men should pray always with the head uncovered; but that women should be covered.[5] They usually prayed too with the hands lifted up towards heaven, and sometimes in the form of a cross.[6] But they required that the whole deportment should be

---

[1] Chrysost. Hom. 29. al. 4. de nat. Dei. Hom. 2. in 2. Cor.—Cæsar. Arelat. Hom. 34. [2] Const. Apost. Lib. viii. cap. 6, 7, 8. [3] Socrat. lib. 3. cap. 13. [4] Tertull. de Orat. cap. 12. cap. 11. [5] Tertull. Apol. cap. 30—de veland. Virg. c. 17. [6] Tertull. Apol. cap. 30.—Minucius, Dial. p. 60.

grave, solemn and becoming, and forbid all theatrical and unseemly performance of any of the above postures and forms.

There is one more custom which may be mentioned, as it was very generally practiced—that of performing divine worship with the face towards the east. It seems to have had its origin in the administration of baptism, and to have passed into the practice of worship in general. The reasons assigned are that it was a symbol of the Sun of righteousness—or of the place of Paradise—or that the east was the noblest part of the creation, the fountain of light and the abode of the good—or that Christ appeared in the east, ascended to heaven in that direction, and from thence will come to judgment.

§ 169. *Of the times of religious assemblies, and of the services appropriate to them.*

During the times of persecution for the two first centuries, there does not appear evidence of any stated times of assembling for divine worship, except on *Sunday*. Justin Martyr expressly speaks of the custom of Christians to assemble from the city and neighborhood on Sunday for the reading of the Scriptures, preaching, prayer, and the communion; but he mentions no other assembly for worship on any other day of the week.[1]

Not long after his time however we find the Church observing the custom of meeting for solemn worship on *Wednesdays and Fridays*, which days were called *stationary* days, because they continued their meetings to a great length of time, usually to three o'clock in the afternoon. These days were also regarded as *semi-jejunia*, half-fast days, but we are now treating of them only as days of public worship. For Tertullian says that on these days the communion was always celebrated—and it is probable the same order of service was observed as on Sundays, except perhaps there was not always a sermon.[2] Basil agrees with Tertullian in making them not only a sort of fast-days, but also communion-days.[3] But to account for the length of time spent in their assemblies, we must suppose additions to the ordinary Sunday service—more psalmody, and intervals for private devotion or silent worship.

[1] Just. Apol. 2. p. 98. [2] Tertull. de Orat. cap. 14. [3] Basil. Ep. 289.

Saturday was also anciently observed with great solemnity as a day of public worship. Concerning the origin of this custom, or the reasons of its observance, it is difficult to set down anything. Athanasius is the first writer who mentions it, and both he and other writers unite in saying that the communion was celebrated and all the usual Sunday service performed on this day—that the observance of it was general throughout the whole Church—and that with an occasional exception in the Latin churches (where it was kept as a fast) it was observed as a festival.[1] Perhaps the custom may have arisen from a regard to the seventh-day Sabbath of the commandments—though it is clear that the day was not required to be kept by abstinence from secular work; which was required on the Lord's day.[2]

Vigils were also held during the *nights previous to* these two great weekly festivals of *Saturday and Sunday*—as preparatory to the solemnities of those days. These vigils differed from the common daily morning (*ante-lucan*) service chiefly in this respect, that while the latter began before light towards the time of cock-crowing in the morning, the former were kept during the greatest part of the night. Hence they were called *watchings through the night*—παννυχίδας, *pernoctationes*, *pervigilia*. These vigils are frequently mentioned by Chrysostom.[3]

Similar vigils were also frequently kept to usher in the greater festivals of the *Nativity*, the *Epiphany*, the *Resurrection*, the *Ascension*, and the descent of the Holy Spirit at *Pentecost:* of which mention is made in various early writers.[4]

Besides these there were vigils frequently observed the night preceding the anniversaries of the festivals of the *martyrs*, of which frequent mention is made.[5] Vigils were moreover not unfrequently kept upon extraordinary occasions of prayer—special emergencies of Church and State, &c.[6]

---

[1] Athanas. Homil. de Semente. tom. 1. p. 1060.—Firm. Ep. Canon. Can. 13. ap. Bev. Pandect. tom. 2.—Socrat. lib. v. cap. 22. vi. 8.—Conc. Laod. can. 16, 49, 51. [2] Conc. Laod. can. 29.—Epiphan. Epit. t. 1. p. 1107.—Basil. Ep. 289. [3] Chrysost. Hom. 4. de verbis Isa. tom. 3. p. 865. [4] Tertull. ad Uxor. lib. 2. cap. 4.—Lactant. lib. 7. cap. 19.—Chrysost. Hom. 30. in Gen.—Socrat. lib. vii. cap. 5. [5] Chrysost. Hom. 59. in Martyres.—Sidon. Appolinar. lib. v. epist. 17. [6] Chrysost. Hom. 20. de Statuis. tom. 1. p. 252.—August. confess. lib. 9. cap. 7.—Ruffin. lib. 1. cap. 12. lib. 2. cap. 16.—Socrat. lib. 1. cap. 37. lib. 5. cap. 11.—Sozom. lib. 2. cap. 29. lib. 3. cap. 6.

The *anniversaries of martyrs* were much observed in the ancient Church as festival days of solemn religious worship. The custom is traced as high as the death of Polycarp, about the year 168, as we learn from an epistle of the Church of Smyrna preserved in Eusebius.[1] Tertullian and Cyprian speak of these anniversaries.[2] Besides the common services of public worship, one thing peculiar to these commemorative festivals was a recital of the history of the lives and sufferings of the martyrs.[3]

Besides the times and occasions of public worship already mentioned, there were also solemn assemblies for preaching and divine service during the whole *forty days of Lent*. This was regarded as a period of fasting, and the communion was not commonly celebrated during the season, except on Saturdays and Sundays—which two days in the week were considered as festivals even during the period of Lent.

The fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide were kept as a continuous festival—divine service being performed each day. This we find from Tertullian's testimony to have been the fact in his day during the persecutions.[4]

This may help to throw light upon the question how soon the custom of daily morning and evening service, throughout the whole year, came into the Church. For if, during the times of persecution, they could keep the festival of pentecost by daily assemblies; and if also the custom of public service on Wednesdays and Fridays was maintained at and before this time;—there is nothing in the way of supposing they might even then have observed the order of daily morning and evening service which we afterwards find established. For shortly after Tertullian's time, we learn from Cyprian that they had morning service and the eucharist every day.[5] The council of Laodicea speaks of the daily evening service, as do also the Apostolical Constitutions, which give the order of it, as well as of the daily morning prayers.[6]

§ 170. *Of the canonical hours of prayer.*

We may conclude these general observations respecting religious worship in the early Church by adverting to such particular hours

[1] Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 15. [2] Tertull. de Coron. cap. 3.—Cypr. Ep. 12 al. 37. [3] August. Hom. 26.—Conc. Carth. iii. can. 47. [4] Tertull. de Idololat. cap. 14. de Coron. cap. 3. [5] Cypr. de Orat. Domin. [6] Conc. Laod. can. 18.—Const. Apost. lib. 8. cap. 35.

of prayer as are spoken of under the name of *canonical hours*, as *matins* or *primes*, *nones*, *vespers*, *&c.* Of these there is no notice taken in the early Church for the first three centuries. They first originated in the monastic institutions, and for a considerable time formed no part of the prescribed customs of the Church in relation to *public* worship; and some of these appointed hours are not even taken any notice of by the Church in appointing or recommending anything concerning *private* devotions.[1]

In the fourth century the observance of these hours began to be admitted in the public services of some churches; although the order and form of the services performed were not precisely the same as those of the monastic institutions.[2] These hours of prayer, were the *first* (*matutina* or *prima*), the *third*, (tertia), the *sixth*, the *ninth*, and the *completorium*, or bed-time.

CHAPTER SECOND.

OF THE ORDER OF THE DAILY MORNING AND EVENING PRAYERS.

§ 171. *Order of the Morning Service.*

The order of daily public morning prayer as it was regularly observed in the Church, is given by the author of the Apostolical Constitutions. This account will be followed with such references for illustration and confirmation as may be found in other writers.

The order begins with the appointment of the sixty-third Psalm, called the *morning Psalm* (ορθρινός ψαλμος): "*O God, thou art my God: early will I seek Thee;*" &c.[3]

Next, (and without any mention of other psalmody or lessons from Scripture) follows the order and forms of prayer for the several classes of catechumens, energumens, candidates for baptism, and penitents—which forms are the same as those used in the general

---

[1] Mede, Epist. 66.—Pearson, Prælect. 2 in Act. Apost.—Cassian. Inst. lib. iii. c. 2, 3, 4.—Cypr. de Orat. Dom. p. 154.—Clem. Alex. Strom. 7. p. 854. Epiphan. Expos. Fid. num. 23.—Chrysost. Hom. 18. in Act. Hom. 6. in i Tim. [2] Conc. Bracar. 1. can. 19. [3] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 37. Comp. lib. ii. c. 59.—Chrysost. Com. in Ps. 140.

service of the Lord's day, and will be noticed more particularly in the account of that service. It will here be only observed farther that these prayers were offered partly by the deacons, bidding the people to pray and reciting before them the several petitions, and partly by the bishop in his invocation and benediction over these several classes as they respectively bowed down before him for this purpose. They were then dismissed.

Then followed the prayers which on Sunday began the communion service—called "prayers of the faithful," or "communicants," because none but such were permitted to be present. These prayers were *that for the Peace of the World, and that for all Orders of Men in the Church*, which on Sundays preceded the consecration of the eucharist,[1] and will be noticed in the account of the Sunday service.

After these prayers followed a short collect for peace and protection during the day. To this the deacon "bid the people," and recited it before them. It was in these words: "Let us beg of God his mercies and compassions, that this morning and this day, and all the time of our pilgrimage may be passed by us in peace without sin: let us beg of God that he would send us the angel of peace, and give us a Christian end, and be gracious and merciful unto us. Let us commend ourselves and one another to the living God, by his only begotten Son."

Immediately after the collect for peace, (the deacon having, in the concluding words of that collect, bid the people to commend themselves to God) the bishop offered the following commendatory collect, called in the Constitutions the *Morning Thanksgiving* (*εὐχαριστία ὀρθρινή*): "O God, the God of spirits and of all flesh, with whom no one can compare, whom no one can approach, that givest the sun to govern the day, and the moon and the stars to govern the night; look down now upon us with the eyes of thy favour, and receive our morning thanksgivings, and have mercy upon us. For we have not spread forth our hands to any strange God. For there is not any new God among us, but Thou our eternal and immortal God; who hast given us our being through Christ, and our well-being

---

[1] With the Const. Apost. ut supra, comp. Chrysost. Hom. vi. in 1 Tim. Dionys. ap. Euseb. lib. vii. cap. 11. Tertull. ad Scap. cap. 2. &c.

through him also. Vouchsafe by him to bring us to everlasting life; with whom unto Thee be glory, honour and adoration, in the Holy Ghost, world without end. *Amen.*"[1]

After this the deacon bid the people bow their heads to receive the bishop's imposition of hands, (χειροθεσια ὀρθρινὴ, *morning imposition*) or benediction, which is given in these words: "O God, faithful and true, that showest mercy to thousands and ten thousands of them that love Thee; who art the friend of the humble, and defender of the poor, whose aid all things stand in need of, because all things serve Thee; Look down upon this thy people, who bow their heads unto Thee, and bless them with thy spiritual benediction; keep them as the apple of the eye; preserve them in piety and righteousness, and vouchsafe to bring them to eternal life, in Jesus Christ thy beloved Son, with whom unto Thee be glory, and honour, and adoration, in the Holy Ghost, now and forever, world without end. *Amen.*"

This being said, the deacon dismissed the congregation, saying in the usual form: "*Depart in peace*"—(προέλθετε ἐν εἰρήνη.)[2]

§ 172. *Whether any Psalms and Lessons were read at daily morning prayers.*

It has been observed that the Apostolical Constitutions give no other psalms or lessons from Scripture to be read at the daily morning service than the *sixty-third*, or "morning psalm." Other writers however mention two other psalms as used in this service namely, the *fifty-first*, and the *ninetieth*.[3] There was no doubt some diversity of custom in this respect in different Churches, and especially connected with the change in practice which obtained when the regular daily morning service was made distinct from the *ante-lucan* or early morning service which began long before day. Originally and during the times of persecution there was no other daily morning service than this *ante-lucan*, even on the Lord's day. Afterwards, when the necessity ceased, these early services were still kept up on week-days for some time, in which, besides various confessions and

[1] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 38. [2] Chrysost. Hom. 52. Tom. 5. p. 713.
[3] Cassian. Instit. lib. 3. cap. 3. lib. 3. cap. 6. Basil, Ep. 63. ad Neocæsar. Tom. 3. p. 26.

prayers, there was also the reading of numbers of psalms and of one or two lessons out of the Old Testament.

§ 173. *Order of the daily evening service.*

The evening service, called the *hora lucernaris*, because it began about the time of *lighting candles*, was in its general order and in most parts of its service the same as the morning prayer. The prayers for the catechumens, energumens, candidates for baptism and penitents, were the same; also the prayers of the faithful, called the "prayers for the peace of the world," and "the whole estate of the Catholic Church."

It differed from the morning service in respect to the *proper psalm*, which was the *hundred forty-first:* "Lord I call upon Thee, haste Thee unto me, and consider my voice when I cry unto Thee," &c. This the author of the Constitutions calls the *proper evening psalm.* (ἐπιλύχνιος ψαλμὸς.)

After this psalm followed the prayers for the catechumens, &c. and of the faithful, being the same as in the morning service.—And these being ended the deacon bid the people to a proper evening prayer, (προσφωνησις ἐπιλύχνιος) the *evening bidding prayers*, in these words: "Let us pray to the Lord for his mercies and compassions; and intreat Him to send us the angel of peace, and all good things convenient for us, and that He would grant us to make a Christian end. Let us pray that this evening and night may pass in peace and without sin, and all the time of our life unblamable and without rebuke. Let us commend ourselves and one another to the living God, through his Christ."[2]

After this the Bishop, if present offered this collect called, (ἐπιλυχνιος εὐχαριστία,) *the evening thanksgiving*, in the following words: "O God, who art without beginning and without end, the maker and governor of all things through Christ, the God and Father of Him before all things, the Lord of the Spirit and king of all things both intellectual and sensible; that hast made the day for works of light, and the night to give rest to our weakness; for the day is thine, and the night is thine; Thou hast prepared the light and the sun: do Thou now, most kind and gracious Lord, receive this our evening

[1] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 35. lib. ii. cap. 59. [2] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 37.

thanksgiving. Thou that hast led us through the length of the day, and brought us to the beginning of the night, keep and preserve us by thy Christ; grant that we pass this evening in peace, and this night without sin; and vouchsafe to bring us to eternal life through thy Christ; by whom be glory and honour and adoration unto Thee in the Holy Spirit, world without end. *Amen.*"

Then the deacon bid the people: "*bow down to receive the benediction with imposition of hands,*" and then the bishop made the following prayer: "O God of our fathers, and Lord of mercy, that hast created man by thy wisdom a rational being, and of all thy creatures upon earth dearest unto Thee, that hast given him dominion over the earth, and hast made us by thy pleasure to be kings and priests, the one to secure our lives, and the other to preserve thy lawful worship: be pleased now, O Lord Almighty, to bow down and show the light of thy countenance upon thy people who bow the neck of their heart before Thee; and bless them by Christ, by whom thou hast enlightened us with the light of knowledge, and revealed thyself unto us; with whom is due unto Thee and the Holy Ghost the comforter, all worthy adoration from every rational and holy nature, world without end. *Amen.*"

After these collects by the bishop, the deacon dismissed the people in the usual form—"depart in peace," and the evening service, as described in this place by the Apostolic Constitutions was concluded.

In another part of the work however this author speaks of another *evening hymn*, a sort of doxology, like that use before the morning prayer; but it is not clear whether it was used in the public service, or was designed for private use.[1] For there was such sort of hymns in use among the early Christians at the first lighting up of candles, of which Basil makes mention, and of which Usher and Smith have given an account from the Alexandrine manuscript of the Septuagint and ancient copies of the Greek psalter.[2]

It may be added that it was a general practice to use the Lord's prayer as a part of the daily morning and evening service, at the conclusion of it.[3]

---

[1] Const. Apost. lib. vii. cap. 48. [2] Basil. de Spir. Sanct. cap. 29. Usher, de Symbolis. p. 35. Smith, Greek church, p. 302. [3] Conc. Gerund. can. 10. Conc. Tolet. iv. can. 9.

CHAPTER THIRD.

OF THE ORDER OF SUNDAY SERVICE; AND FIRST, A MORE PARTICULAR ACCOUNT OF THE MISSA CATECHUMENORUM, OR ANTE-COMMUNION SERVICE.

§ 174. *The Psalmody.*

The service commonly began with the reading or singing of psalms,[1] though there might have been some diversity of practice in different churches; for the author of the Constitutions prescribes first a lesson of the old Testament before the Psalms, and Basil speaks of a confession first made by all kneeling, after which rising they began the psalms.[2]

Yet if the psalmody be taken as the first and leading part of the service, it is not to be supposed that it was all performed at once, but it was in many churches divided by lessons and prayers interspersed between the psalms.

Thus the council of Laodicea made a canon "that the psalms should not be sung one immediately after another but that a lesson should come between every psalm."[3] And Augustine intimates that this was the practice in his church.[4]

These plams were called *psalmi responsorii*, the *responsories*, which was the title of all psalms that fell in between the lessons in the ordinary course. The council of Toledo speaks of them under this title, blaming such as neglect to sing the *gloria patri* at the close of them.[5] The reason for the name may be that one person singing, was answered by the whole choir,—or because they immediately followed and answered to the lessons.[6]

Besides these psalms in ordinary course, there were proper psalms for particular days and particular offices of worship, as the communion, funerals, &c.

The number of psalms read in the ordinary course varied at dif-

---

[1] Hieron. Ep. 22. ad Eustach. cap. 15.—Cassian. Instit. lib. ii. cap. 6.
[2] Const. Apost. lib. ii. cap. 57. lib. v. cap. 19. Basil. Ep. 63. ad Neocæsar.
[3] Conc. Load. can. 17. [4] August. Serm. 10. de verbis Apost. p. 112.
[5] Conc. Tolet. iv. can. 15. [6] Isodor. de offic. lib. i. cap. 8.—Rupert. de offic. lib. i. cap. 15.

ferent times and places; sometimes as many as eighteen or twenty being used, but generally the number was twelve, and this number appears at length to have been reduced in many places to six, and then to three.[1]—Sometimes besides the proper and ordinary psalms, the bishop or precentor ordered particular psalms for particular occasions and emergencies.[2]

In some places, instead of the lesson from Scripture, a short space for silent devotion, and a short collect by the minister, was interposed between the psalms.[3]—In all ths western churches, except the Roman, the *gloria patri* was used at the end of every psalm; but this was not the practice of the eastern churches, who used it only at the end of the last psalm.

As to the persons who performed this service it may be remarked, that the psalms were sometimes sung by one only, sometimes by the whole congregation joining together, which was the more ancient practice, and prevailed until the custom of alternate singing was introduced. In this alternate singing the congregation was sometimes divided into two parts, one part singing one verse and the other the next, and thus on. This mode of singing was sometimes called *antiphonal hymnody*, sometimes *responsaria*.[4]

Besides these there was still another mode very common in the fourth century—when a single person, called a *precentor*, (ὑποβολεὺς) began the verse and the people joined with him in the close. [This was called among the Greeks "ὑπηχεῖν," and "ὑπακουεῖν," and among the Latins "*succinnere*."]

The psalmody was always performed by the people standing.—As to the kind of music or manner of reciting the psalms, it may be remarked that there were two sorts, the one more complex, and the other very plain, with but little variety of notes, corresponding to the very plain chants of modern times, or to the slightly musical way of reading the psalms in the English cathedral churches. This seems to have been the common mode in the African churches. Augustine says that Athanasius ordered the reader to sing the psalm with so little variety of note and tone that it was rather reading than

---

[1] Cassian. Instit. lib. ii. cap. 2. cap. 4 cap. 13. [2] Athanas. Apol. ii. 717. August. in Ps. 138. Ambros. Ep. 33. ad Marcell. Soror. [3] Cassian. Inst. lib. ii. cap. 4. [4] Socrat. lib. vi. cap. 8. Ambros. Hexam. lib. iii. cap. 5.

singing.[1] This kind of plain recitative or simple melody was very much commended among the ancients; though they did not condemn a more artificial style of harmony, provided it was kept within due bounds and subservient to the ends of devotion.[2] Nor, it may be remarked, did they condemn the use of psalms and hymns of human composition merely as such, provided they agreed with the analogy of faith and were for the edification of the people. Two things are however severely inveighed against in relation to this part of the service; first all conformity to the standards of secular taste, as complicated music and artificial modes of performing it, such as was used in the theatres, &c.; and secondly, every thing generally, which tended rather to amuse and please the ear than to elevate and improve the heart.[3]

§ 175. *A more particular account of some of the most noted hymns.*

The first of these that may be mentioned is the lesser doxology or *Gloria Patri*. The most ancient form of this is shorter than that now in use, and was used as a single sentence without a response. It was in these words: "Glory be to the Father and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, world without end. Amen." The clause "as it was in the beginning is now, and ever shall be," which is now inserted in it, is not mentioned till the council of Vaison, A. D. 529, which says it was so used in Italy, Africa, and all the East. Some suppose this clause was inserted about the time of the council of Nice, to guard against Arianism. But there are a variety of forms of expressing this doxology to be met with, the substance of them all being however the same; and it is likely no exception was taken to this liberty, where no heretical doctrine was intended to be couched under it. The *Gloria Patri* was of very general use at the close of nearly every solemn office of worship.

Another noted hymn of the ancient Church was the greater doxology or *Gloria in excelsis*, called also the *angelical* hymn, from beginning with the words of the song of the angels: Glory be to God on high, &c. This was chiefly used in the communion service.

---

[1] August. Confess. lib. x. cap. 33. [2] August. Conf. lib. x. cap. 33.
[3] Hieron. in Ephes. v. August. Confess. lib. x. cap. 33. Isodor. lib. i. cap. 90.
[4] Conc. Vaison. ii. can. 5.

Another hymn of note was the *Trisagion* or cherubical hymn, the original form of which was in these words: "Holy! Holy! Holy! Lord God of Hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory, who art blessed forever. Amen." This is the form given in the Apostolical Constitutions, and in Chrysostom.[1] Afterwards the Church added some words to it, and sung it in this form: "Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy upon us." This form was used by the council of Chalcedon.[2] Various changes and corruptions were made or attempted at various periods, but the history of them cannot be followed here. This has been done in a special treatise by Alix.[3] This hymn was chiefly sung in the middle of the communion service.

Next may be mentioned the *Hallelujah* and the *Halleluatic Psalms*. The former was the most common, and consisted in the solemn repetition of the word in special parts of divine service upon certain days, where it was used much like the form "praise ye the Lord" with the response, "the Lord's name be praised," as practiced now-a-days in the Church. Augustine says it was never sung in some churches except upon Easter day and the fifty days of Pentecost;[4] but in other churches it was used at other times. In the church of Rome it was never sung but upon Easter day.[5] It was by some councils expressly forbidden to be used in lent, and upon other days of fasting.[6] When used it was sung by all the people, and Augustine terms it "the Christian's sweet *call* (κέλευσμα) whereby they invited one another to sing praises unto Christ.[7] The *Halleluatic psalms* were psalms commencing with the Hallelujah.

We may notice next the "*Benedicite*," or song of the three holy children in the furnace. Athanasius orders this to be used in private devotions; but the council of Toledo, says it was sung in the Church all over the world, and orders it to be used in the Spanish churches.[8] Chrysostom, two hundred years before, made the same declaration as this council, that it was used in all places in the pub-

---

[1] Const. Apost. lib. viii, cap. 12. Chrysost. Hom. 1 de verb. Isa. [2] Conc. Chalced. Act. 1. [3] Alix. de Trisagis. [4] August. Ep. 119. ad Januar. cap. 17. [5] Sozom. lib. vii. cap. 19. [6] Conc. Tolet. iv. can. 10. [7] Aug. de cant. nov. cap. ii. tom ix. comp. Hieron Ep. 30. cap. iv. [8] Conc. Tolet. iv. can. 13.

lic service of the Church.[1] It was sung in many churches much in the place as it now holds in our service, between the first and second lesson.[2]

"The "*Te Deum*" is another ancient hymn still retained in the order of the book of Common Prayer. The origin of it is obscure. Common opinion ascribes it jointly to Ambrose and Augustine; some writers to Ambrose alone; but since bishop Usher found it in two MSS. acribed to Nicettus, bishop of Triers in France, the learned have generally attributed it to him.

There were many other hymns and books of hymns composed for the use of the Church by various writers—as Ambrose, Hilary, Claudianus, &c.; some of which are still extant, in whole or in part.

§ 176. *Of the reading of the Scriptures as a part of public service.*

The next thing to be considered in speaking of the order of public service in the ancient Church is the reading of Scriptures, although it is to be borne in mind, as has been mentioned, that in many churches the lessons of Scripture were interspered with the psalmody as in the practice of the present day.

These lessons were always two and sometimes three or four—taken partly from the Old, and partly from the New Testament, except in the Church of Rome where for the first four ages, only the Epistle and Gospel were read. The author of the Constitutions speaks of four lessons besides the Psalms, two out of Moses and the Prophets, and two out of the Epistles and Gospels.[3] To the same effect Justin Martyr.[4] The canons of the council of Laodicea, and of the third council of Carthage, and Cyril's Catechetical Discourses show the practice of reading lessons from the Old, as well as the New Testament—for they give a catalogue of such books as were read (*legomena*), hence also called *canonical* books, because they are enrolled in these catalogues or list (*canones*) of such as might be read in the public service of the Church.[5]

The order in which the Scriptures were read appears always to have been according to some rule, though it might have varied in

---

[1] Chrysost. tom. iv. p. 593. [2] Mabillon. de Liturg. Gallic. [3] Const. Apost. lib. ii cap. 57. [4] Justin. Apol. ii. p. 98. [5] Conc. Laod. can. 59. 50.—Conc. Carth. iii. can. 47.—Cyril Catech. iv. n. 22.

different regions of the Church. There were however certain lessons so established and appropriated to certain times and seasons, as that no others might be read in their place. So says Augustine,[1] who particularly instances Easter, when for four days in succession the history of Christ's resurrection was read out of the four Gospels.[2] In Passion week they read the history of his sufferings and death; and also the book of Job from the Old Testament, and during the period between Easter and Pentecost, they read the Acts of the Apostles.[3] In Lent they usually read in Genesis. As to the other Scriptures, they were either read in the order in which they lie in the Bible, or were appointed at the discretion of the bishops.[4]

§ 177. *By whom the Scriptures were read.*

During the two first centuries there was no distinct order of persons called readers, and the lessons were probably read by the deacons, or by some such person as the bishop might designate for the occasion. But in the third century the order of readers appears as one of the inferior orders of clergy; and from Cyprian's epistles it would seem that it was the office of the readers to read not only the lessons, but the gospel.[5] But in some churches the reading of the gospel belonged to the office of the deacons and presbyters. The Apostolical Constitutions give a rule: "after that the other lessons are read by the readers, let a deacon or a presbyter read the gospels."[6] Thus Jerome reminds Sabinianus, the deacon, "how he had read the gospels in the Church."[7] Socrates gives the same intimation with reference to a presbyter.[8] Sozomen says that at Alexandria the gospel was read only by the arch-deacon, in other churches by the deacon, in others by the presbyters only, and on the greater festivals by the bishop.[9] The ancient practice was always to read the gospel and epistle before the communion service began, so as to allow the catechumens to hear it.

---

[1] August. Expos. in 1 Joh. [2] Idem. Serm. 139, 140, 141. 144. de Tempore. [3] Chrysost. Hom. 88 in Matt.—Hom. 63. [4] Mabil. de Cursu Gall. August. in Ps. xc. Ser. 2. [5] Cypr. Ep. 34. al 39. 37. [6] Const. Apost. lib. ii. cap. 57. [7] Hieron. Ep. 48. ad Sabin. [8] Socrat. lib. vii. cap. 5. [9] Sozom. lib. vii. cap. 19.

§ 178. *Solemnities and ceremonies connected with the reading of the Scripture.*

In some churches the custom prevailed of the readers saying to the people "*pax vobis, peace be with you*—when about to commence the reading. This custom Cyprian alludes to, and it seems to have continued in Africa till the third council of Carthage forbid the readers to use this salutation—because it was the usual form appropriate to the office of a bishop, or presbyter, or deacon. The council therefore order that it should be said by one of the superior clergy before the reader began the lessons.[1] Augustine mentions it as the custom of the bishop to utter this salutation as soon as he entered the church, which was immediately before the reader began the lessons.

Chrysostom describes it as the custom for the deacon, before the reader began, to "stand up and cry with a loud voice, *let us give attention*, repeating it several times; after that the reader names the place of the lesson, and before he begins to read, he also cries aloud, '*Thus saith the Lord.*'"[2]

It was sometimes a practice, upon the naming of the lessons for the people to unite in saying *Deo gratias, thanks be to God;* and during the reading of the Gospel it was a very general custom for all the people to stand up. Thus the Constitutions: "when the Gospel is read, let the presbyters, and deacons, and all the people stand with profound silence."[3] In the African Church it was the custom for all to stand whenever any part of the Scripture was read."[4] In regard to this custom of standing, Chrysostom has this remark: "if the letters of a king are read in a theatre with great silence, much more ought we to compose ourselves, and stand up with attentive ears, when the letters not of an earthly king, but of the Lord of angels are read to us."[5]

There is no evidence before the middle ages of the practice of saying, when the Gospel was named—*Glory be to thee O Lord.*

---

[1] Cypr. Ep. 33. al 38. ad cler. Carth. Conc. Carth, iii. can. 4. [2] Chrysost. Hom. 19. in Act. [3] Const. Apost. lib. ii. cap. 57. [4] Cypr. Ep. 34. al. 39. August. Hom. 26. ex. 50. tom. x. p. 174. [5] Chrysost. Hom. i. in Matt.

Grotius says it was common for the people to say *Amen*, at the close of the Epistle, and this response is inserted in some rituals at the close of the Gospel."[1]

Jerome mentions one ceremony as peculiar to the eastern churches—the carrying of lighted candles before the Gospel when it was to be read. This he says was not practiced in the western churches; and no author but him mentions it as a custom of the eastern churches.[2]

§ 179. *Of preaching in the ancient Church; by whom performed.*

Immediately after the reading of the psalms and lessons came the sermon, commonly called among the Greeks the *homily*, and sometimes the *discourse*, (λόγος) answering to the Latin *sermo*, and the English sermon. These discourses are also styled *tractates*, *disputions*, and *allocutions*. It is to be noticed that the word κήρύσσειν, *prædicare*, *preaching*, when used in the ancient canons and other writers, does not refer to the preaching of sermons, but to the deacon's office of making solemn proclamation and giving directions to the people in different parts of the service, in set forms of words, of which notice has been taken.

But preaching in the modern sense of the word—delivering public homilies or discourses—was regarded as the proper office of the bishops and presbyters in all ordinary cases, and not of the deacons.[3] In special cases, as the feebleness or indisposition of the presbyter, deacons were sometimes allowed to deliver homilies or pious discourses composed by the fathers of the Church.[4] Preaching indeed was the proper office of the bishop; and in the African churches a presbyter was never allowed to preach in the cathedral church in the presence of the bishop, until the time of Augustine, who was the first presbyter that did so.[5] In the lesser churches of the cities, and in the country, the office of preaching was discharged by the presbyters as the bishop's proper assistants. Still it is to be specially noted that the ancient writers and canons speak of it as eminently the office and duty of bishops to preach the Gospel.

In regard to the question whether laymen were ever allowed to

[1] Grotius, Annot. in Philem. ver. 25. [2] Hieron. contr. Vigilant. cap. iii.—Cave, Prim. Christ. lib. i. cap. vii. [3] Chrysost. Hom. ii. in Tit.—Ambros. de Offic. lib. 1. c. 1. [4] Conc. Vasens. ii. can. 2. [5] Possid. Vit. August. cap. 5.

preach, it may be remarked that in extraordinary cases laymen were sometimes permitted, or appointed by a special commission from the bishop, publicly to teach and expound the Scriptures; but unless in such special cases it was held irregular and unlawful for them to do it. Hence when some eastern monks—who were no more than laymen—undertook to preach publicly in the churches, Leo wrote to the bishop of Antioch to restrain them, for "that besides the priests of the Lord, none ought to presume to take upon them the power of teaching or preaching."[1] This prohibition did not extend to the right of private teaching as catechists, in the catechetic schools, as at Alexandria, where Origen read lectures before he was in orders.[2]

It has been held that during the continuance of the miraculous gifts of the Spirit in the very earliest times of the Church, there was a general commision given to all Christians, thus supernaturally endowed, to preach.[3] Be this as it may, certain it is that after the Apostolic age none were allowed to preach without being duly called and appointed in the ordinary way to the sacred office; and as it is very clear that even deacons were not allowed to preach as a part of their ordinary functions, but only by the special license of the bishop,[4] it was for the stronger reason forbidden to laymen to take this office upon themselves.

Women were never allowed to preach. The Church held fast to the Apostolical injunction on this point, and always censured and condemned those heretics who violated it. The fourth council of Carthage when allowing laymen to preach by special license of the bishop in extraordinary cases, expressly forbids women to do it in any case whatever.[5] This did not interfere with their right to give private instruction as catechists—which was one duty of the deaconesses.

§ 180. *Of the number and frequency of sermons.*

It was frequently the case that two or three sermons were preached in succession at the same assembly, first by the presbyters and then by the bishop, who, when present, usually closed this part of the

---

[1] Leo. Ep. 60. al. 62. ad Max. Antioch.—Euseb. lib. vi. c. 19. [2] Euseb. lib. vi. c. 3.—Hieron. de Script. c. 36. [3] Ambros. Com. in Ephes. iv. [4] Const. Apost. lib. iii. cap. 20. [5] Conc. Carth. iv. can. 99.

service. Thus the Apostolical Constitutions say: "when the Gospel is read, let the presbyters one by one, but not all, speak the word of exhortation to the people, and last of all the bishop who is the governor or pilot of the ship.[1] The same thing appears from Chrysostom's sermons preached when a presbyter at Antioch, in which he alludes to the bishop as intending to preach after him, in some such form as this: "it is now time for me to keep silence that our master may have time to speak."[2]

When two or more bishops happened to be present together, it was usual for several of them to preach in immediate succession, reserving the last place to the most venerable person.[3]

In some places they had a sermon every day, especially in Lent, and during the festival days of Easter; and many passages of ancient authors speak of sermons twice a day upon special occasions.[4] This however relates chiefly to the cities and large churches; for Chrysostom says, "they that lived in the cities enjoyed continual preaching; but they that dwelt in the country had not such plenty."[5]

§ 181. *Of the sorts and ways of preaching.*

There were four principal sorts of sermons distinguished in the ancient Church. 1. Expositions of Scripture. 2. Panegyrical discourses upon the saints and martyrs. 3. Sermons upon particular festivals, times and occasions. 4. Sermons upon particular doctrines and subjects of morality. The writings of Chrysostom and Augustine furnish examples of all these sorts. Thus we have expository homilies of Augustine upon whole books of Scripture; his sermons *de Sanctis* are panegyries upon the saints and martyrs; his sermons *de Tempore*, are upon festivals and other solemn occasions; and those entitled *de Diversis* embrace a variety of doctrinal and practical subjects.

Sermons were sometimes carefully studied and written before delivering, and sometimes delivered extempore, and taken down by notaries or short hand writers in the Church. Origen was the first

---

[1] Const. Apost. lib. ii. cap. 57. [2] Chrysost. Hom. ii. de verb. Isa. Hom. iii. &c. [3] Hieron. Ep. 61. ad Pammach. cap. iv. [4] Hieron. Ep. 61. ad Eustoch. cap. xv.—Chrys. tom. i. Hom. 9. 25. 23. 40. 42. &c.—Basil. Hexam. Hom. 2. 7. 9. [5] Chrysost. Hom. 65. de Martyribus.

who began this custom, which he did not till above sixty years of age, when having acquired facility by long practice, he suffered the notaries to take down his sermons, which before he had not allowed.[1] Chrysostom, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Augustine, who were among the most celebrated ancient preachers, besides their precomposed sermons, frequently also delivered extempore discourses.

This practice of extempore preaching led to the custom of sometimes prefacing the sermon with a short prayer invoking the divine assistance—in regard to which it is not to be thought they expected any special miraculous inspiration of the Holy Spirit, like that which was enjoyed by the apostles, but only that ordinary aid and concurrence with their endeavours which all are justified in seeking and asking, to bless them in the performance of duty.—Besides such short invocations at the beginning of their sermons, they also frequently made them at the conclusion, and sometimes in the middle of their discourses—calling upon the people also to pray for them. These short petitions were however distinct from the order of the common prayers of the Church. Sometimes these invocations were in the direct form, as in that which Ambrose is said to have used before his sermons: "I beseech thee, O Lord, and earnestly intreat thee, give me an humble knowledge which may edify———put into my mouth the word of consolation, and edification, and exhortation, that I may be able to exhort those that are good to go on to greater perfection, and reduce those that walk perversely to the rule of thy righteousness, both by my word and my example. Let the words which thou givest thy servant be as the sharpest darts and burning arrows which may penetrate and inflame the minds of my hearers to thy fear and love."[2] Sometimes they were in the indirect form, as in Augustine where he says, "attend to the psalm, and may the Lord grant us ability to open the mysteries that are contained in it."[3]

Before beginning the sermon, it was usual also in many places to use the common salutation, "*peace be with you*," or "*the Lord be with you*," to which the people answered, "*and with thy spirit*."

[1] Euseb. lib. vi. cap. 36. [2] Ambros. Orat. ap. Ferrar. de Concinion vet. lib. i. cap. 8. [3] Aug. in Ps. 91. [4] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 5.

But there was nothing in the ancient Church answered to the *ave marias*, or invocation of the Virgin, practised in the Romish Church before sermon. Sometimes instead of the short form of prayer, the sermon was prefaced with a short benediction, as on occasions of special distress or special prosperity.

Sometimes the sermon was not founded upon any particular text of Scripture, but treated of such matters as were thought best for edification; but generally a text was taken out of the psalms or lessons of the day—and not seldom the sermon was made upon several texts or a large portion of Scripture. Whichever method in this respect was adopted, it was much insisted on that the topics of discourse should be weighty and important subjects of Christian doctrine or duty, and delivered in the manner best suited to the capacities of the hearers and best adapted to convince, impress, and benefit them—not designed to please the fancy, but to instruct the mind, to persuade the will and improve the heart.

As to the length of the ancient sermons, it may be observed that as the whole service lasted not above two hours, the sermons, would not well have occupied more than an hour; and when there were more than one preached at a time, each singly must have taken much less time. Of the ancient sermons extant, scarcely any would occupy an hour in the delivery, most of them not half that time, and many of them much less. There are many in Augustine, which might be delivered in eight or ten minutes.

Preachers did not always deliver their own compositions, as appears from what has been said respecting the permission sometimes given to deacons to read the sermons of the Fathers. The sermons of famous preachers, such as Chrysostom, Ephrem of Syrus, were in this way often delivered from the pulpit in many churches. Nor was the practice confined to deacons, but sometimes followed by presbyters and bishops. Gennadius says of Cyril of Alexandria, that he composed many sermons which were committed to memory and delivered by the Grecian bishops. Sermons were always concluded with a doxology to the Holy Trinity.[2]

---

[1] Genad. de Scriptor. cap. 27. [2] Basil de Spir. Sanct. cap. 29.

§ 182. *Some customs connected with prēaching.*

It was the common practice for the preacher to sit when delivering his sermon: though there was no certain and uniform rule about it. In Africa it appears to have been the general custom, as may be seen from Optatus and Augustine.[1] So also Chrysostom represents himself as sitting when he preached, and Gregory Nyssen, Justin Martyr, and Origen, speak of the same thing.[2]

It was the general custom for the people to stand during the sermon. In the African churches this posture was made obligatory on the people.[3] It was also the general custom of the French churches,[4] and of some of the Greek churches;[5] but in Italy not only the bishops sat when they preached but also the people, "lest" as Augustine remarks, "any weak person through weakness should grow remiss in attention, or be forced to leave the assembly;"[6] and this he thinks the best practice.

There was one peculiar custom in the African Church, designed to quicken and preserve the attention of the hearers. When the preacher chanced to mention in the body of his discourse any remarkable text of Scripture, the people were to join with him in repeating the close of it. Thus Augustine in one of his sermons notices that having begun to quote the words of St. Paul, "the end of the comandment is"—before he would proceed further he called upon the people to join with him in repeating it, upon which they all cried out—"charity out of a pure heart."[7] This practice is mentioned only by Augustine, and it may not have been general even in the African churches.

It was a much more general custom for the people to testify their approbation or pleasure by acclamations and applauses in the church, by words, by clapping their hands, and by other tokens of pleasure.[8] Though these tokens of applause were not utterly disallowed, yet

---

[1] Optat. lib. iv. p. 78.—August. Hom. 28. ex 50. tom. x. p. 179. [2] Chrysost. Hom. 16 ad Poenit. tom. i. p. 662. Greg. Nyss. Hom. 5. de Orat. Dom. Justin. Apol. ii. p. 97. Orig. Hom. 20 in Num. [3] Ferrar. lib. ii. cap. 15 ex August. [4] Sidon. Apol. carm. 16. ad Faust. Reins. [5] Euseb. de Vit. Constant. lib. iv. cap. 33. [6] August. de Catechiz. Rudib. cap. 13. [7] August. Hom. 36. ex editis a Sirmondo. [8] Paul. Emisen. Hom. de. Incarnat. in Act. Concil. Ephes. p. iii. cap. 31.—Hieron. Ep. 75. contr. Vigilant.

they were not greatly favoured in the Church; but other tokens of the effects of preaching were preferred, as sighs, tears, and above all obedience to the truth.[1]

It was very common for the discourses of the preachers to be taken down in short hand by the hearers. In this way many sermons have been handed down word for word. This was sometimes done by a sort of public notaries—sometime the preachers appointed or allowed particular persons to do this,—and sometimes notes more or less perfect were taken by the hearers as their own inclination prompted.

§ 183. *Of the prayers in the ante-communion service.*

Anciently the greatest part of the public prayers came after the sermon. Thus Justin Martyr describing the public worship of Sunday says: "they first read the Scriptures, then the bishop or President made a discourse or exhortation, after which they all rose up together and made their common prayers," &c.[2] To the same effect Chrysostom.[3] The only prayers which preceded the sermon were such short forms of salutation, and benediction, or brief collect immediately before the sermon, as have been mentioned. The reason of having the sermon before the common prayers was that there were many orders of men who might hear the Scriptures and sermon, who were not permitted to hear the prayers. In the first place, all Jews and Infidels, and also a class of catechumens and penitents called the *hearers*, were obliged to withdraw immediately after the sermon, and not allowed to hear the prayers for the other orders of catechumens, penitents, and energumens. And secondly, after the prayers began, those different classes of persons were successively dismissed at the conclusion of the prayers respectively appropriate for them, until at the close of the ante-communion service, and the commencement of the communion service, none remained present but the faithful or communicants, and one class of persons permitted to see but not join in the celebration of the eucharist.

---

[1] Hieron. Ep. 2. ad Nepot.—Chrysost. Hom. 55. tom. v. p. 742. Hom 16. t. v. p. 220. &c. [2] Justin. Apol. ii. p. 98. [3] Chrysost. Hom. 27. tom. i. p. 365. Hom. 11. in 1. Thess.

§ 184. *Of the prayers for the catechumens.*

The sermon being ended, and all not permitted to remain having departed, the deacon proclaimed again: "Pray ye catechumens," and "let all the faithful with attention pray for them, saying the Lord have mercy upon them." Then he began a prayer called *a bidding prayer for the catechumens*, because the deacon preceded them in the form, bidding them what and how to pray. Two forms of this prayer remain, one in Chrysostom and the other in the Apostolical Constitutions. The latter is in these words:

"Let us all beseech God for the catechumens; that he who is gracious, and a lover of mankind, would mercifully hearken to their supplications and prayers, and, accepting their petitions, would help them, and grant them the requests of their souls according to what is expedient for them; that he would reveal the gospel of Christ to them; that he would enlighten and instruct them, and teach them the knowledge of God and divine things; that he would instruct them in his precepts and judgments; that he would open the ears of their hearts to be occupied in his law day and night; that he would confirm them in religion; that he would unite them to, and number them with his holy flock, vouchsafing them the laver of regeneration, with the garment of incorruption and true life; that he would deliver them from all impiety; and give no place to the adversary to get advantage against them; but that he would cleanse them from all pollution of flesh and spirit, and dwell in them, and walk in them by Christ; that he would bless their going out and their coming in and direct all their designs and purposes to their advantage. Farther yet, let us earnestly pray for them, that they may have remission of sins by the initiation of baptism, and be thought worthy of the holy mysteries, and remain among the saints."

Then the deacon, addressing himself to the catechumens themselves, said, "Catechumens arise. Pray for the peace of God, that this day, and all the time of your life may pass in quietness and without sin; that you may make a Christian end, and find God propitious and merciful, and obtain remission of your sins. Commend yourselves to the only unbegotten God by his Christ."

To every petition of this bidding prayer the people, and especially children, are appointed to subjoin, "Lord have mercy upon them."

After this the deacon bids them bow down, and receive the bishop's benediction; which is in the following form of direct invocation:

"O Almighty God, who art without original and inaccessible, the only true God, thou God and Father of Christ thy only begotten Son, God of the Comforter, and Lord of all things; who by Christ didst make learners become teachers for the propagation of Christian knowledge; look down now upon these thy servants, who are learning the instructions of the gospel of thy Christ: and give them a new heart, and renew a right spirit within them, that they may know and do thy will with a perfect heart and willing mind. Vouchsafe them thy holy baptism, and unite them to thy holy Church, and make them partakers of thy holy mysteries, through Christ our hope, who died for them, by whom be glory and worship unto thee, world without end. *Amen.*" After this, let the deacon say, "Catechumens, depart in peace." [1]

The forms given in Chrysostom are substantially the same, the differences being very slight, and mostly verbal. Chrysostom probably gives the forms used in the liturgy of the church of Constantinople, and the author of the Constitutions those perhaps which were used in the church of Antioch.[2]

§ 185. *Of the prayers for the energumens.*

The next prayers were for that class of persons regarded as possessed by evil spirits. This class were particularly under the care of the exorcists, whose duty it was to attend them and pray over them in private; yet they also received the public prayers of the Church, and were permitted to be present at such parts of the service as had relation to them. Therefore as soon as the deacon had dismissed the catechumens, with the usual form, he cried out again: "*Pray, ye energumens, who are vexed with unclean spirits;*" and exhorting the congregation to pray also, he recited the prayer in these words: [3] "Let us pray ardently for them that the merciful God, through Christ, would rebuke the unclean and evil spirits, and deliver his supplicants from the oppression and tyranny of the ad-

---

[1] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 6. [2] Chrysost. Hom. iii. in 2. Cor. p. 740.
[3] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 6.

versary; that he who rebuked the legion of devils, and the prince of devils, the fountain of evil, would now rebuke these apostates from piety, and deliver the works of his own hands from the molestations and agitations of Satan, and cleanse them which he hath created in great wisdom. Let us farther most ardently pray for them. Save them, and raise them up, O God, by thy power."

Then he bids them bow down their heads, and receive the bishop's benediction, which is in the following form of words, immediately addressed to Christ: "O Thou only-begotten God, the Son of the Great Father; thou that bindest the strong one, and spoilest his goods; that givest power unto us to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy: that hast delivered the murdering serpent unto us a prisoner, as a sparrow unto children; thou, before whom all things shake and tremble at the presence of thy power; that makest satan to fall from heaven to the earth as lightning, not by a local fall, but by a fall from honour to disgrace, because of his voluntary malice; thou, whose looks dry up the deep, and threatenings make the mountains melt, whose truth endures forever; whom infants praise, and sucklings bless, and angels celebrate and adore: that lookest upon the earth, and makest it tremble: that touchest the mountains and they smoke: that rebukest the sea, and driest it up, and turnest the rivers into a wilderness: that makest the clouds to be the dust of thy feet, and walkest upon the sea as upon a pavement: rebuke the evil spirits, and deliver the works of thy hands from the vexation of the adverse spirit: for to thee belongs glory, honour, and adoration, and by thee to thy Father in the Holy Spirit, world without end. *Amen.*"

§ 186. *Prayers for the Competentes, or candidates for Baptism.*

The third prayers, in the course of this part of the service, were for those catechumens who had passed nearly through the period of catechumenship, and had given in their names for baptism at the next approaching festival. Perhaps this was an occasional office used only at those seasons between Lent and Easter, which were specially devoted to preparation for baptism; for no other author but that of the Constitutions mentions it, and the council of Laodicea, in appointing the order of divine service, speaks of the prayers for the catechumens as immediately following the sermon, then the prayers for the penitents, and after those the prayers of the faithful

which begin the communion service.[1] It may be that this office was included in the prayers for the catechumens in general. But whenever the order given in the Apostolical Constitutions was followed, the prayer for the *competentes* came in immediately after that for the energumens. As soon as the deacon had dismissed the energumens, it is appointed for him to say:[2] "*Pray ye candidates for baptism:* and we that are already believers, let us ardently pray for them; that the Lord would make them worthy to be baptized into the death of Christ, and to rise again with him, and to be made members of his kingdom, and partakers of his mysteries; that he would unite them to his holy Church, and number them with those that shall be saved therein. Save them and raise them up by thy grace."

Then they were ordered to bow down their heads, and receive the bishop's benediction, which is expressed in the following words: "O God, who didst by the prediction of thy holy prophets, say to them that are to be initiated, wash ye, make you clean; and by Christ didst appoint a spiritual regeneration; look down now upon these persons, who are to be baptized; bless and sanctify them; fit and prepare them that they may be worthy of thy spiritual gift, and the true adoption of sons, and thy spiritual mysteries, and be deservedly numbered among those that are saved, by Christ our Saviour, through whom be all glory, honour, and adoration unto thee, and the Holy Ghost, world without end. *Amen.*"

§ 187. *Prayers for the Penitents.*

The last sort of prayers in the ante-communion service were for penitents, such that is, as were under the discipline and censure of the Church. Some of them, called *hearers only*, had been sent away with the catechumen hearers, but others of them, called *kneelers* or *prostrators*, were allowed to stay longer, to hear the prayers of the Church for them, and to receive the bishop's benediction. As soon therefore as the candidates for baptism had been dismissed, the deacon proclaimed: "*Ye that are under penance make your prayers:* and let us ardently pray for our brethren that are doing penance: that the God of mercy would show them the way of repentance; that he would admit their recantation and confession; that he

[1] Conc. Laod. can. 19. [2] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 35, and 37.

would shortly bruise satan under their feet; and deliver them from the snare of the devil, and the incursion of evil spirits, and preserve them from all evil words, all absurd practices, and all impure thoughts; that he would grant them pardon of all their sins, voluntary and involuntary, and blot out the hand writing that is against them, and write them in the book of life; that he would cleanse them from all pollution of flesh and spirit, and unite and restore them to his holy flock; for he knows our frame; for who can glory that he has a clean heart? or who can say that he is pure from sin? for we are all liable to punishment. Let us still pray more ardently for them, because there is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth; that they may turn from every evil work, and accustom themselves to all that is good; that the merciful God receiving them kindly, may restore to them the joy of his salvation, and confirm them with his princely spirit, that they may never fall or be shaken again; that they may communicate in his holy solemnities, and be partakers of his sacred mysteries; that being made worthy of the adoption of sons, they may obtain eternal life. Let us all farther say for them: Lord have mercy upon them: save them, O God, and raise them up by thy mercy."

Then the deacon bid them rise up and bow down their heads to receive imposition of hands from the bishop, with a benedictory prayer in these words: "O Almighty and eternal God, the Lord of the whole world, the maker and governor of all things, who hast made man to be an ornament of the world, through Christ, and hast given him both a natural and a written law, that he might live by the rules thereof, as a rational creature; that hast also, when he hath sinned, given him a motive and encouragement to repent, even thy own goodness: look down now upon those men, who bow the necks of their souls and bodies unto thee; for thou desirest not the death of a sinner, but his repentance, that he should turn from his evil way, and live. Thou that acceptedst the repentance of the Ninevites; that wouldst have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth; that receivedst again the prodigal son, who had spent his substance in riotous living, with the compassionate bowels of a father, because of his repentance: accept now the repentance of these thy supplicants; for there is no man that sinneth not against thee: if thou, Lord, wilt mark what is done amiss, O Lord, who may abide it? for there is mercy and propitiation with

thee. Restore them to thy holy Church, in their former dignity and honour, through Christ our God and Saviour; by whom be glory and adoration unto thee, in the Holy Ghost, world without end. *Amen.*"[1]

CHAPTER FOURTH.

A MORE PARTICULAR ACCOUNT OF THE MISSA FIDELIUM OR COMMUNION SERVICE.

§ 188. *Prayers preceding the consecration; the silent prayer.*

When the prayers for the catechumens, energumens, and penitents, were ended, the *missa catechumenorum* was concluded by the dismission of the penitents. There remained then none in the Church besides the communicants, except a class of penitents who having gone through all the stages of penance were awaiting the bishop's absolution and reconciliation to the altar. These were called *consistentes*, *co-standers*, and were permitted to be present at the communion, but only as spectators.

The communion service began by a silent or mental prayer offered by the people privately. The council of Laodicea mentions this silent prayer in a canon which summarily describes the whole order of the communion service: "after the homily of the bishop, first the prayer of the catechumens is to be made; and after the catechumens are gone forth, then the prayer for the penitents: and when they have received their benediction by imposition of hands, and are withdrawn, then the three prayers of the faithful are to be made, the first of which is to be performed in silence, the second and third by the bidding and direction of the deacon. After these the kiss of peace is to be given; the presbyters saluting the bishop, and laymen one another; and then the holy oblation shall be celebrated; those of the clergy only communicating in the chancel."[2]

In this canon the *silent prayer* (Εὐχὴ διὰ σιωπῆς) is expressly distinguished from the prayers διὰ προσφωνήσεως, *bidding prayers*, such

---

[1] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 8. cap. 9.

[2] Conc. Laod. can. 19.

as the whole Church made in common at the call of the deacon, who recited the forms of the several petitions, to each of which the people subjoined: "*Lord have mercy, and grant the petitions we ask*," much in the same way as in the modern Litany. And then the bishop added the Ἐπίκλησις, the *invocation*, called also the *collect*, because it was a *summary*, or brief repetition of the substance of all the foregoing prayers.

It may not be uninteresting to give a specimen of the offices of devotion designed for the season of silent prayer, taken from the old Gallican Liturgy:[1]

"O thou most admirable Majesty and great God, Almighty Father, who art of infinite goodness and power, I who am a most vile sinner, and condemned by the testimony of my own conscience, do approach thee, and present myself in the sight of thy greatness, before the eyes of thine ineffable majesty, before thy holy face not without due reverence, yet with great unworthiness and neglect of duty. I do not excuse, but accuse myself unto thee. I confess, I say I confess the unrighteousness of my impiety, that thou mayest forgive the wickedness of my sin. I confess, that if thou dost not forgive, thou mayest punish me. I confess myself a criminal before thee, and yet I know my amendment is only in words. In words I endeavour to appease thee, but in works I offend thee. I am sensible of my faults and yet I defer the amendment. Assist me therefore, assist me, O thou ineffable goodness. Pardon me, pardon me, O most adorable Trinity. Spare me, spare me, spare me, I beseech thee, O merciful God. Hear me, hear me, hear me, I beseech thee, when I cry in the words of that prodigal son, O Father, Eternal God, I have sinned against heaven and before thee, I am no more worthy to be called thy son, make me as one of thy hired servants. And now, merciful Father, I fly to the only refuge and haven of thy mercy under the protection of Christ, that what is vile in me, Thou mayest favourably vouchsafe to accept in Him, who livest and reignest forever and ever. Amen!"

The above is given as a specimen of the kind of offices which were thought proper for the period of silent worship, because these silent prayers occupied considerable time in the services of the early Church, especially in the vigils and service of the *stationary* days,

[1] Bona. Rer. Liturg. lib. ii. cap. 1.

constituting, indeed, with the psalmody, the chief additions to the usual service. Basil, speaking of the night assemblies of Christians, says that they spent much of the time in private prayers mingled with various sorts of psalmody.[1] These private or silent offices of confession were however not such as are prescribed in the Romish missæ, addressed to saints or angels; nor were they like the Romish confessions made to priests, but, as in the specimen given above, were always made to God alone. The old rituals have the forms "*silentium indicere*" and "orationem dare," to denote the custom of bidding the people fall to their private devotions. In these silent prayers both ministers and people joined. The only part of the modern service corresponding to this ancient custom, is found in the order of ordination in the book of Common Prayer.

§ 189. *The "bidding prayers"—preceding the oblation.*

Next after the silent prayers, as described in the forecited canon of Laodicea, are those denominated the "*bidding prayers*," so called because the deacon called upon the people to pray, and also directed them what to pray for. In the Apostolical Constitutions we have a form of this sort of prayers entitled a *direction*, or *bidding prayer for the communicants*, (προσφώνησις ὑπερ τῶν τιστῶν)."[2] It is there introduced with these words: "Let none of those that are not allowed, come near. As many as are believers, let us fall upon our knees. Let us pray to God through his Christ. Let us all intensely beseech God through his Christ." Then follow the several petitions in this order:

"Let us pray for the peace and tranquillity of the world and the holy Churches; that the God of the whole world would grant us his perpetual and lasting peace; and keep us persevering to the end, in all the fulness of piety and virtue."

"Let us pray for the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church from one end of the earth to the other; that the Lord would keep it unshaken and undisturbed with storms and tempests, founded on a rock to the end of the world."

"Let us pray for the Holy Church (παροικίας) in this place; that the Lord of all would grant us grace to pursue his heavenly hope

[1] Basil. Ep. 63. ad Neocæsar. tom. i. p. 96. [2] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 9, 10. vid. etiam lib. ii. cap. 57.

without ceasing; and that we may render Him the continual debt and tribute of our prayers."

"Let us pray for the whole episcopate or company of bishops under heaven, that rightly divide the word of truth. And let us pray for James, our bishop, and his Churches."

"Let us pray for Clemens, our bishop, and his Churches."

"Let us pray for Euodius, our bishop, and his Churches: that the merciful God would preserve them in safety, honour, and length of days for the benefit of his Holy Churches; and grant them a venerable old age in all piety and righteousness."

"Let us likewise pray for our presbyters, that God would deliver them from every absurd and wicked thing, and preserve them safe and honourable in their presbytery."

"Let us pray for the whole order of deacons and sub-deacons in Christ; that the Lord would keep them unblamable in their ministry."

"Let us pray for the readers, singers, widows, and orphans."

"Let us pray for those that live in matrimony and procreation or education of children, that God would have mercy upon them all."

"Let us pray for the eunuchs that walk in holiness."

"Let us pray for those, that live in continency or virginity, and lead a pious life."

"Let us pray for those, that make oblations in the holy church, and give alms to the poor."

"Let us pray for those that offer their sacrifices and first-fruits to the Lord our God; that the most gracious God would reward them with heavenly gifts, and restore them an hundred fold in this world, and grant them everlasting life in the world to come; giving them heavenly things for their earthly, and for their temporal things those that are eternal."

"Let us pray for our brethren that are newly baptized; that the Lord would confirm and establish them."

"Let us pray for our brethren, that are afflicted with sickness; that the Lord would deliver them from all their distempers and infirmities, and restore them again in health to his holy Church."

"Let us pray for all those, that travel by sea or by land."

"Let us pray for those, that are in the mines, and in banishment, and in prison and in bonds for the name of the Lord."

"Let us pray for our enemies and those that hate us."

"Let us pray for those, that persecute us for the name of the Lord: that the Lord would mitigate their fury, and dissipate their anger conceived against us."

"Let us pray for those, that are without, and led away with error, that the Lord would convert them."

"Let us remember the infants of the Church; that the Lord would perfect them in his fear, and bring them to the measure of adult age."

"Let us pray mutually for one another; that the Lord would keep and preserve us by his grace unto the end, and deliver us from the evil one, and from all the scandals of those, that work iniquity, and conduct us safe to his heavenly kingdom."

"Let us pray for every Christian soul."

"Save us, O God, and raise us up by thy mercy."

Here also, as in the prayers for the catechumens, we are to suppose the people responded at the end of the several petitions, "*Lord have mercy upon them*," or "*save them, O God, and raise them up by thy mercy*."

The above form bears a strong resemblance, it will be perceived, to the litany and to the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church, in the book of Common Prayer. This prayer is not found in so complete a form either in Chrysostom or any other ancient writer, but there are fragments of references sufficient to show that either the same or a similar form was used in the Church generally.[1]

§ 190. *The invocation or collect preceding the oblation, made by the bishop.*

As soon as the foregoing bidding prayer had been made, the deacon called out: "*Let us rise up, and praying earnestly, let us recommend ourselves and one another to the living God by his Christ.*"[2] Then the bishop offered a prayer, called by the Greeks, *the invocation*, and by the Latins *the collect*, in the following words:

"O Lord Almighty and Most High, Thou that dwellest in the highest, Thou Holy one that restest in thy saints (or holy places),

---

[1] Chrysost. Hom. de Obscur. Prophet. tom. iii. p. 946.—Hom. 16. in 2. Cor. Hom. 71. al 72. in Matt.—August. Ep. 119. ad Januar. cap. 18. Ep. 107. ad Vital.—Basil, Ep. 241. [2] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 11.

that art without original, the great Monarch of the world; who by thy Christ hast caused thy knowledge to be preached unto us, to the acknowledgment of thy glory and name, which He hath manifested to our understandings: look down now by Him upon this thy flock, and deliver it from all ignorance and wicked works. Grant that it may fear Thee, and love Thee, and tremble before the face of thy glory. Be merciful and propitious unto them, and hearken to their prayers; and keep them unchangeable, unblamable, and without rebuke; that they may be holy both in body and soul, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that they may be perfect, and none among them deficient or wanting in any respect. O Thou, their Defender, Thou Almighty, that regardest not persons, be Thou the help of this thy people, whom thou hast redeemed with the precious blood of thy Christ. Be Thou their defence and succour, their refuge and keeper, their impregnable wall, their bulwark and safety. For no one can pluck them out of thy hand. There is no other God like Thee: in Thee is our hope and strong consolation. Sanctify them by thy truth: for thy word is truth. Thou that dost nothing out of partiality and favour; Thou that canst not be deceived, deliver them from sickness and infirmity, from sin, from all injury and fraud, and from the fear of the enemy, from the arrow that flieth by day, and the danger that walketh in darkness; and vouchsafe to bring them to eternal life, which is in Christ thy only begotten Son, our God and Saviour; by whom be glory and worship unto Thee in the Holy Ghost, now and for ever, world without end. Amen!"

§ 191. *Of the offerings of the people made at the altar.*

Next after the bishop's invocation followed the oblations or offerings of bread, wine and other things made by the people, and out of which the elements designed to be consecrated for the eucharist were taken. These offerings were to be made freely according to each one's ability, and besides furnishing the materials for the celebration of the eucharist, and a common feast afterwards for the poor, formed also a fund for the relief of orphans, the sick, strangers, &c. and for the various expenses of the church.

At first these offerings were made by none but actual communicants. It was accounted a peculiar privilege to make them, to be

debarred from which, was a sort of lesser excommunication. Hence they would not receive the offerings of persons who were at variance with their brethren, neither at the altar, nor into the treasury.[1] Nor were those permitted to make offerings, who were guilty of any oppression of the poor, of fraud, or of other vices and sins, or who followed scandalous or unchristian callings.[2] None, who having a right to partake of the eucharist, yet neglected it, were allowed to make these offerings; nor any excommunicated persons, nor energumens, nor penitents, in short none except such as were in actual full communion with the Church.[3]

As to the things offered by the people, the most ancient custom was to offer only such things as were proper for the service of the altar. There are several canons to this effect in the Apostolical Canons, one forbidding any thing to be offered as a substitute for bread and wine,—another specifying, that besides bread and wine, only oil for the lamps, and incense should be received,—another ordering that all other first fruits, besides those of corn and grapes, should be carried home to the bishop to be divided among the clergy.[4] Some canons besides the first fruits of corn and grapes, mention milk and honey as things to be received on the day before Easter, the solemn time of baptism—for the use of the Church in that ceremony.[5]

In some churches however the custom was to receive money or whatsoever other gifts of value were offered which with the first fruits of corn and grapes, went to form the fund for the maintenance of the clergy, the support of the poor, and other expenses of the Church.

It was the practice for the deacons to mention the names of such as made oblations of any considerable value.[6] The Constitutions direct the bishop to acquaint the poor who were their benefactors, that they might pray for them.[7] Jerome blames those who were led by this custom of rehearsing the names of donors, to give out of vanity and ostentation.[8]

---

[1] Conc. Carth. iv. can. 93.—Optat. lib. vi. p. 93. [2] Conc. Carth. iv. can. 94.—Const. Apost. lib. iii. cap. 8. lib. cap. 6. [3] Conc. Eliber. can. 28. can. iv. [4] Can. Apost. can. 3. can. 4. can. 5. [5] Conc. Carth. iii. can. 24. Con. African. can. iv. [6] Cypr. Ep. 10 al. 16.—Hieron. Com. in Ezek. 18. p. 537. [7] Const. Apost. lib. iii. cap. 4. [8] Hieron. in Jerem. xi. lib. ii. p. 354. in Ezek. 18.

§ 192. *Of the elements used in the Eucharist, common bread and wine.*

It has been already observed that the elements used in the eucharist were taken from the offerings of the people, so long as the custom of offering bread and wine continued. The bread was consequently the leavened bread in common use; nor was the use of wafers or unleavened bread known in the Church till the eleventh or twelfth century. It is expressly said in some writers that the bread used in the eucharist was the same as that in common use which was leavened,[1] but concerning the use of unleavened bread no mention is made. Epiphanius expressly notes it as a peculiarity of the Ebionite heretics that they celebrated the eucharist with unleavened bread and water—leaving it plainly to be inferred that the practice of the Catholic Church was different.[2] The use of unleavened wafers probably came in after the custom of receiving oblations of bread and wine from the people ceased, and grew out of some imagined greater fitness, and perhaps from a regard to the unleavened bread of the passover used in the original institution. Although in itself of no importance, yet fierce disputes have been made between the Greek and Latin churches on this subject.

The other element of *wine* was always used in the Catholic Church, commonly mingled with water. There were however some ancient heretics, who under pretence of abstinence or temperance used only water in the eucharist. Some of these were the disciples of Ebion, and some the followers of Tatian. They were called *Hydroparastatæ*, and *Aquarians*, from their use of water; also *Encratites*, *Abstinent*, because they abstained from the use of wine, and sometimes from flesh, as unlawful. Under these names they are frequently mentioned and condemned by Epiphanius, Augustine, Theodoret, and others.[3] Chrysostom calls it the pernicious heresy of those that used only water in their mysteries, whereas our Lord instituted them in wine; and also, after his resurrection, drank wine at his common table, to prevent the budding of this wicked heresy.[4]

[1] Ambros. de Sacram. lib. iv. cap. 4. [2] Epiphan. Hær. 30. Ebionit. n. 16. [3] Epiphan. Haer. 46. August. de Hær. cap. 64. Theodor. de Fabulis Hæret. lib. i. cap. 20. [4] Chrysost. Hom. 83 in Matt. p. 700.

To the same effect, long before, Irenæus, and Clemens Alexandrinus as well as the council of Trullo, and others, at a latter period.[1]

The ancient Church censured and condemned all who made any alteration in the elements of the eucharist, as well as those heretics who, under pretence of spiritual worship, rejected the material symbols of the eucharist, baptism, &c.

§ 193. *Of the Oblation and Consecrating Prayers.*

When the offerings of the people had been received, and bread and wine set apart for the eucharist, the consecration of them began. The order of this service is described in the Apostolical Constitutions.[2]

The deacon called out saying: "*Let us give attention.*" Then the bishop saluted the people saying: "*the peace of God be with you all;*" and the people responded: "*and with thy spirit.*" After this the deacon says: "*salute ye one another with an holy kiss.*" "Then the clergy salute the bishop, and laymen their fellow-laymen, and the women the women; the children standing before the *bema*, that is either the reading-desk or the altar; with a deacon attending them to see that they keep good order; others of the deacons walking about the Church, and inspecting the men and women, that there be no tumult, nor making of signs to one another, nor whispering, nor sleeping; and others standing at the men's gate, and the subdeacons at the women's gate, that the doors be not opened for any to go in or out in the time of oblation. After this, the subdeacon brings water to the priests to wash their hands, as a sign of the purity of those souls that are consecrated unto God. Immediately after this a deacon cries out, 'Let none of the catechumens be present, none of the hearers, none of the unbelievers, none of the heterodox party. Ye that have made the first prayer, *draw near:* for this seems to be spoken to the communicants as an invitation; ye mothers take your children and bring them with you. Let no one come with enmity against another; no one in hypocrisy. Let us stand upright before the Lord, with fear and trembling to offer our sacrifice.' This said, the deacons bring the τὰ δῶρα, *the*

---

[1] Iren. lib. v. cap. 1. Clem. Alex. Strom. i. p. 375. Pædag. lib. ii. cap. 2. Conc. Trull. can, 32. Cod. Theodos. lib. xvi. tit. 5. de Hæret. leg. 7. &c.

[2] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 11, 12.

elements, to the bishop at the altar; the presbyters standing on each hand of him, and two deacons with their fans to drive away the little insects, that none of them fall into the cup. Then the bishop standing at the altar with the presbyters, makes a private prayer by himself, having on his white or bright vestment, and signing himself with the sign of the cross in his forehead. Which done, he says, 'The grace of Almighty God, and the love of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost be with you all!' And the people answer with one voice 'And with thy spirit!' Then the bishop says, 'Lift up your hearts:' and they all answer, 'We lift them up unto the Lord.' The bishop says again, 'Let us give thanks to the Lord;' and the people answer, 'It is meet and right so to do.' Then the bishop says, 'It is very meet, and right, above all things, to praise Thee the true God, who art before all creatures, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, who art the only unbegotten, without original, without king, without lord, who hast need of nothing, who art the author of all good, who art above all cause and generation, and always the same, of whom all things have their original and existence. For thou art original knowledge, eternal sight, hearing without beginning, and wisdom without teaching; the first in nature, and the law of existing, exceeding all number. Who madest all things to exist out of nothing by thy only-begotten Son, whom Thou didst beget before all ages by thy will, and power, and goodness, without the intervention of any, who is thy only-begotten Son, the Word that is God, the living wisdom, the first-born of every creature, the angel of thy great Council, thy high priest, but the King and Lord of all the creatures, both visible and invisible, who is before all things, and by whom all things consist. For Thou, O eternal God, didst create all things by Him, and by Him Thou dost vouchsafe to rule and govern them in the orderly ways of thy providence. By whom Thou didst give them being, by Him also Thou didst give them a well-being. O God and Father of thy only-begotten Son, who by Him didst create the cherubims and seraphims, the ages and hosts, the dominions and powers, the principalities and thrones, the archangels and angels, and after them didst by Him create this visible world, and all things that are therein. For thou art He that hast established the heavens as an arch, and extended them like a curtain: that hast founded the earth upon nothing by thy sole will; that hast fixed the firmament,

and formed night and day; that hast brought the light out of thy treasures and super-added darkness for a covering, to give rest to the creatures that move in the world; that hast set the sun in the heaven to govern the day, and the moon to govern the night; and ordered the course of the stars, to the praise of thy magnificent power; that hast made the water for drink and purgation, and the vital air both for breathing and speaking; that hast made the fire to be a comfort in darkness, to supply our wants, and that we should be both warmed and enlightened thereby; that hast divided the great sea from the earth, and made the one navigable, and the other passable on foot; that hast filled the one with small and great animals, and the other with tame and wild beasts; that hast crowned the earth with plants and herbs of all sorts, and adorned it with flowers, and enriched it with seeds; that hast established the deep, and set a great barrier about it, walling the great heaps of salt water, and bounding them with gates of the smallest sand; that sometimes raisest the same deep to the magnitude of mountains by thy winds, and sometimes layest it plain like a field; now making it rage with a storm, and then again quieting it with a calm, that they, which sail therein, may find a safe and gentle passage: that hast begirt the world, which Thou createdst by Christ, with rivers, and watered it with brooks, and filled it with springs of living water always flowing, and bound up the earth with mountains, to give it a firm and unmoveable situation. Thou hast filled thy world, and adorned it with odoriferous and medicinal herbs, with a multitude and variety of animals, weaker and stronger, some for meat, and some for labour, some of a mild and some of a fiercer nature; with the hissing of serpents, and sweeter notes of birds of divers kinds; with the revolution of years, and numbers of months and days, and orders of stated seasons, with flying clouds producing rain, for the procreation of fruits, and preservation of animals; winds to blow in order at thy command, and a multitude of plants and herbs. Neither hast Thou only made the world, but created man in it to be the citizen of the world, and made him the ornament of thy beautiful structure. For Thou saidst to thy Wisdom, let us make man in our own image and likeness, and let him have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air. And therefore Thou madest him of an immortal soul, and a dissolvable body; creating the one out of nothing,

and the other out of the four elements; and gavest him in his soul a rational knowledge, a power to discern between piety and impiety, and a judgment to distinguish between good and evil; and in his body the privilege and faculty of five several senses, with the power of local motion. For Thou, O God Almighty, didst by Christ plant Paradise in Eden towards the East, adorning it with all kinds of plants meet for food, and placing man therein as in a well-furnished house: and in his creation thou gavest a natural law implanted in his mind, that thereby he might have within himself the seeds of divine knowledge. And when Thou hadst placed him in the paradise of delights and pleasure, Thou gavest him power to eat of all things, only forbidding him to taste of one kind, in expectation of something better: that if he observed that command, he might attain to immortality, as the reward of his obedience. But he neglecting this command, and by the fraud of the serpent, and the counsel of the woman tasting the forbidden fruit, Thou didst justly drive him out of Paradise, and yet in goodness did not despise him, when he had destroyed himself; for he was thy workmanship; but Thou, who didst put the creatures in subjection under him, didst appoint him to get his food by labour and sweat, thy providence concurring to produce, augment and bring all things to maturity and perfection. Thou didst suffer him for awhile to sleep the sleep of death, and then with an oath calledst him again to a regeneration: dissolving the bands of death and promising him life by a resurrection. And not only so; but giving him an innumerable posterity, Thou didst glorify such of them as adhered to Thee, and, punishedst those that apostatized from Thee; receiving the sacrifice of Abel as an holy man, and rejecting the offering of Cain as abominable for murdering his brother. Thou didst also receive Seth and Enos, and translate Enoch. For thou art the creator of men, and the author of life, and the supplier of all their wants, their lawgiver, that rewardest those, that keep thy laws, and punishest those, that transgress them. Thou didst bring an universal deluge upon the world because of the multitude of the ungodly, but deliveredst righteous Noah out of the flood with eight souls in thy ark, making him the end of the preceding generation, and the father of those that were to come. Thou didst kindle a dreadful fire against the five cities of the Sodomites, and turn a fruitful land into a vale of salt, for the wickedness of

them that dwelt therein, but didst deliver righteous Lot from the burning. Thou art He that didst deliver Abraham from the impiety of his ancestors, and madest him to become heir of the world, and didst manifest thy Christ unto him. Thou didst appoint Melchisedech to be the high priest of thy service. Thou didst declare thy servant Job, after many sufferings, to be conqueror of the serpent, that first author of evil. Thou madest Isaac to be the son of promise. Thou madest Jacob to be the father of twelve children, and his offspring to be innumerable, and broughtest three score and fifteen souls into Egypt. Thou, Lord, didst not despise Joseph, but for his chastity madest him to rule over the Egyptians. Thou, Lord, didst not forget the Hebrews, when the Egyptians oppressed them, because of the promise made to their fathers; but didst punish the Egyptians, and deliver thy people. And when men had corrupted the law of nature, written in their minds, and some began to think the creatures had their existence of themselves, and honoured them above what was meet, placing them in the same rank with Thee the God of all; Thou didst not suffer them to wander in error, but raising up thy holy servant Moses, Thou didst by him promulge a written law to revive and support the law of nature; shewing the creatures to be the work of thy hands, and thereby expelling the error of polytheism out of religion. Thou didst honour Aaron and his posterity with the dignity of the priesthood. Thou didst chastise the Hebrews, when they sinned; and received them into favour, when they turned unto Thee. Thou didst punish the Egyptians with ten plagues; and dividing the sea, madest the Israelites to pass through it; drowning the Egyptians that pursued them. Thou madest the bitter sweet with wood; Thou broughtest streams out of the rock, when Thou hadst divided the top of it; Thou didst rain down manna out of heaven, and give them food out of the air, a measure of quails for every day; setting up a pillar of fire to give them light by night, and the pillar of the cloud to shadow them from heat by day. Thou didst constitute Joshua the captain of thy armies, and by him destroy the seven nations of the Canaanites, dividing Jordan, and drying up the rivers of Ethan, and laying flat the walls of Jericho, without any engines of war or concurrence of human power. For all these things we glorify Thee, O Lord Almighty. The innumerable armies of angels adore Thee; the arch-

angels, thrones, dominions, principalities, dignities, powers, hosts, and ages; the cherubims, and seraphims also with six wings, with two of which they cover their feet, and with two their faces, and two fly, saying, with thousand thousands of archangels, and ten thousand times ten thousand angels, all crying out without rest and intermission: and let all the people say together with them, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord of hosts: heaven and earth are full of thy glory: blessed art Thou for ever. Amen!'

And after this let the bishop say, 'for Thou truly art holy, the most holy, the most high, far exalted above all things for evermore. Holy also is thy only begotten Son, our Lord and God, Jesus Christ; who ministering to Thee his God and Father in all things, both in various works of creation and providence, did not despise lost mankind; but after the law of nature, after the admonitions of the written law, after the reprehensions of the prophets, after the administrations and presidency of angels; when men had corrupted both the natural and written law, and erased the memory of the flood, and the burning of Sodom, and the plagues of Egypt, and devastations and slaughters of Palestine, and were now all ready to perish; He, who was the Creator of man, chose by thy will to become man; the Lawgiver, to be under the law; the Highpriest, to be the sacrifice; the Shepherd, to be made a sheep; whereby He appeased Thee his God and Father, and reconciled the world, and delivered all men from the wrath, that hanged over their heads, being born of a virgin, and made flesh, God the Word, the beloved Son, the first born of every creature; according to the prophecies which He Himself predicted of Himself, made of the seed of David and Abraham, and of the tribe of Judah: He who was the Former of all things that are made, was formed himself in the virgin's womb; He, who is without flesh, was made flesh; and He who was begotten, ἀχρόνως, *before all time*, was born in time: He lived an holy life, and taught an holy doctrine; expelling all manner of sicknesses and infirmities from the bodies of men, and working signs and miracles among the people; He, who feeds all that have need of food, and fills every living creature of his own good pleasure and bounty, did himself partake of meat and drink and sleep; He manifested thy name to them that knew it not: He put ignorance to flight, and revived true piety and godliness, fulfilled thy will, and finished the work, which

thou gavest Him to do: and when all things were thus set in order and rectified by Him, He was betrayed by the incurable malice of one of his own disciples, and apprehended by the hands of the wicked, priests and high-priests, falsely so called, together with a sinful people; of whom he suffered many things, and underwent all manner of indignities by thy permission; He was delivered to Pilate the governor: the Judge himself was judged; the Saviour of the world condemned; He, who is impassible, was nailed to the cross; He, who is immortal by nature, was made subject to death; and the Author of life, who quickens all things, was laid in the grave, that He might deliver those from suffering, for whose sake He came, and set them free from death, and break the bonds of the devil, and deliver men from his frauds and impostures: He rose again the third day from the dead, and conversed forty days with his disciples, and was taken up into heaven, and set at thy right hand, his God and Father.

'We therefore, in commemoration of these things, which He suffered for us, give thanks to Thee, Almighty God, not as Thou deservest, and as is our duty, but ὅσον δυνάμεθα, *as far as we are able*, so fulfilling his command. For in the same night that He was betrayed, He took bread in his holy and immaculate hands, and looking up to Thee his God and Father, He brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, this is the mystery of the New Testament; take of it, and eat it; this is my body, which is broken for many for the remission of sins. Likewise He mixed a cup of wine and water, and sanctifying it, He gave it unto them, saying, drink ye all of this: for this is my blood, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. This do in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew forth my death till I come. We therefore being mindful of his passion, and death and resurrection from the dead, and his return into heaven; and also of his second coming, when he shall return with glory and power to judge the quick and dead, and to render to every man according to his works, do offer unto Thee, our King and God, this bread and this cup, according to his appointment, giving thanks to Thee by Him, for that Thou dost vouchsafe to let us stand before Thee, and minister unto Thee; and we beseech Thee to look propitiously upon these gifts here set before Thee our God, who hast need of nothing, and

to accept them favourably to the honour of thy Christ, and to send thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice, who is the witness of the suffering of our Lord Jesus, that it may make this bread the body of thy Christ, and this the blood of thy Christ; that they, who partake of it, may be confirmed in godliness, and obtain remission of sins, may be delivered from the devil and his impostures, may be filled with the Holy Ghost, and be made worthy of Christ, and obtain eternal life, Thou being reconciled to them, O Lord Almighty.'

'We beseech Thee further, O Lord, for thy Holy Church from one end of the earth to the other, which Thou hast purchased with the precious blood of thy Christ, that Thou wouldst be pleased to keep it unshaken and immoveable by any storms or tempests to the end of the world. We pray also for the whole episcopacy, or universal college of bishops, rightly dividing the word of truth. We pray for me thy unworthy servant, who am now offering unto Thee, and for the whole presbytery, and deacons, and all the clergy, that Thou wouldst give them all wisdom, and fill them with thy Holy Spirit. We pray Thee, O Lord, for the king and all that are in authority, and for the whole army, that our affairs may be transacted in peace; that passing our time in quietness and concord, we may glorify Thee through Jesus Christ, our hope, all the days of our life. We offer unto Thee for all thy saints, that have lived well-pleasing in thy sight from the foundation of the world, for patriarchs, prophets, holy men, apostles, martyrs, bishops, confessors, presbyters, deacons, subdeacons, readers, singers, virgins, widows, laymen, and all whose names Thou knowest. We offer unto thee for this people, that Thou wouldst make them, to the glory of thy Christ, a royal priesthood, and an holy nation; for all that live in virginity and chastity; for the widows of the Church; for all that live in honest marriage and procreation of children; for the infants of thy people; that none of us be a cast-away. We pray Thee for this city, and all that dwell therein; for those that are in sickness, in cruel bondage and slavery, in banishment, or under confiscation and proscription, for all that travel by sea or by land, that Thou wouldst be their succour, and an universal helper and defender to them all. We pray Thee for those that hate us, and persecute us for thy name, for them that are yet without, and wandering in error, that Thou wouldst convert them to good, and mitigate their fury. We pray

Thee for the catechumens of the Church; for the energumens, that are tossed and tormented by the adversary the devil; for all our brethren that are doing penance, that thou wouldst perfect the former in faith, and cleanse and deliver the second from the power and agitation of the wicked one; and receive the repentance of the last, and pardon both them and us whatever offences we have committed against Thee. We offer unto Thee likewise for the temperature of the air, and the increase of the fruits of the earth, that we continually partaking of those good things, which Thou bestowest on us, may without ceasing praise Thee, who givest food unto all flesh. We also pray for those, who upon any just and reasonable cause are now absent, that Thou wouldst vouchsafe to preserve us all in godliness, and keeping us without change, blame, or rebuke, to gather us into the kingdom of thy Christ, the God of all things in nature, visible and invisible, and our King. For to Thee, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is due all glory and worship and thanksgiving and honour and adoration, now and for ever throughout all ages world without end. And let all the people answer, Amen!'

After this the bishop is appointed to say again, 'The peace of God be with you all!' to which the people answer, 'And with thy spirit!' And then the deacon calls upon the people to join with him in another prayer, which is termed προσφώνησις, &c. *a bidding prayer* for the faithful after the divine oblation, in these words: 'Let us pray yet again and again to God by his Christ, for this gift which is offered to the Lord God; that the good God would receive it to his altar in heaven for a sweet smelling savour by the mediation of his Christ. Let us pray for this Church and people; for the whole society of bishops, and presbyters, and deacons, and ministers, and the whole Catholic Church; that the Lord would keep and preserve them all. Let us pray for kings and all that are in authority; that our affairs may go on with tranquillity, and that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. Let us commemorate the holy martyrs, that we may be thought worthy to have fellowship in their conflicts and engagements. Let us pray for those that rest in faith; let us pray for the temperature of the air, and increase of the fruits of the earth, that they may grow to perfection. Let us pray for those that are newly baptized, that they may be confirmed in faith. Let us all exhort and excite one

another. Let us rise and commend ourselves to God by his grace. Then let the bishop say: O God, thou art great, great in name, great in counsel, and mighty in works; the God and Father of thy Holy Son Jesus our Saviour; look favourably upon us and this thy flock, which Thou hast chosen in Him to the glory of thy name. Sanctify our bodies and souls; and grant, that we, being pure from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, may obtain the good things that are set before us; and that thou mayest judge none of us unworthy, but be our helper, defender, and protector, through thy Christ; to whom with Thee and the Holy Spirit, be glory, honour, and praise, doxology, and thanksgiving for ever. Amen!'

And when all the people have said, Amen! Let the deacon cry again, Πρόσχωμεν, *Let us give attention.* Then the bishop shall speak to the people, saying, 'Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις, *Holy things for those that are holy.*' And the people shall answer, 'There is one Holy, one Lord, one Jesus Christ, to the glory of God the Father, blessed for ever. Amen! Glory be to God on high, and in earth peace, good will towards men. Hosanna to the son of David; blessed be the Lord God, that came in the name of the Lord, and manifested Himself unto us: hosanna in the highest!'

This is the whole service preceding the act of communicating, as it is delivered in the Constitutions."

Such is the order of the consecration service and prayers as given by the Apostolical Constitutions; and substantially the same may be collected from various ancient writers, as Tertullian, Cyprian, Chrysostom and the canons of the council of Laodicea.

It will be remarked that the prayer for the dead differs somewhat from the thanksgiving in our book of Common Prayer, for all God's "servants departed this life in faith," &c. It was the custom of the ancient Church to pray for the dead in Christ, but not from any belief in purgatory. That their prayers for the dead did not proceed upon the notion of purgatory, is clear from the fact that these prayers were offered for saints, martyrs, prophets and apostles, and all holy men, who were supposed to be in a state of rest and perfection. It is to be noted however that these prayers are in part commemorative and of the nature of thanksgiving; and when they are more than this, they are made upon supposition that the dead are objects of divine mercy, and capable of being advanced to higher degrees of perfection.

The Constitutions make no mention of the rehearsing of the creed and the Lord's Prayer immediately after the consecrating Prayer. It was not at that time the custom to use the creed except in the office for baptism. It was not brought into the communion service till the fifth century.

The Lord's Prayer was introduced into the communion service much earlier. Augustine, Cyril, Optatus, Chrysostom, and others speak of it as the general custom of the Church. It was said immediately after the consecrating prayer. At this place likewise the penitents received absolution, and probably the occasional benedictions were given, for the first fruits and other oblations, and consecration of the holy oil, &c.

The consecration was always performed in an audible voice,[1] and with the ceremony of breaking the bread.[2]

§ 194. *Of Communicants.*

All baptized persons, in full communion with the Church, were not only permitted but required to partake of the eucharist. The ancient canons are very express on this point. The Apostolical Canons say: "all such of the faithful as come to church, and hear the Scriptures read, but stay not to the prayers and partake of the holy communion ought to be suspended as authors of disorder in the Church.[3] The council of Antioch to the same effect.[4] But in Chrysostom's time it seems there were those who did not wish to partake of the communion, and yet wished to stay during the whole communion service. Against such he inveighs in a long and eloquent passage, which shows that the sense and requisition of the Church was that none should decline partaking of the eucharist upon pretence of unworthiness, who were not also deemed unworthy to be present at the prayers of the communion office.[5]

But in the next age this discipline was more and more relaxed and those of the faithful, who did not choose to communicate, were permitted to stay during the whole service till after the Lord's prayer and the bishop's benediction, which immediately preceded the act of

---

[1] Bona, Rer. Liturg. lib. ii. cap. 13. [2] Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. i. p. 318. [3] Can. Apost. Can. vid. etiam Can. 8. [4] Conc. Antioch. Can. 2. [5] Chrysost. Hom. iii. in Ephes. p. 1051.

partaking, after which they were dismissed. Some councils recognize this practice,[1] but it was plainly a deviation from the primitive rules. This at a later period led to another corruption—that of giving to non-communicants a sort of consecrated bread, distinct however from the eucharist, and called *eulogiæ*, which word in the primitive times signified the eucharist itself. There is no ground whatever in the practice of the early Church for the Romish abuses of private and solitary mass, nor for the *missa sicca*, the *missa nautica*, the *dry mass*, the *seamen's mass*, &c.

Heretics and schismatics were reckoned among the excommunicated, and not admitted to the communion except upon confession and reconciliation.

For several ages the practice prevailed of giving the eucharist to infants as soon as they were baptized. Cyprian often mentions this as the common practice,[2] and the Apostolical Constitutions, as has been seen, bids mothers bring their infants with them. The reason of the practice seems to have been in some notion of the necessity of partaking the eucharist to salvation. Yet it is difficult to reconcile this practice, with the well known custom of training the young for some time as catechumens, before they were admitted either to baptism or the eucharist. The latter must be regarded as the more general practice of the Church.

To those members of the Church who were absent for good and sufficient cause, it was not uncommon for the deacons to be sent to carry a portion of the consecrated elements.[3] Especially was this done in the case of those who were sick, or in prison as martyrs or confessors, and also of such penitents as were at the point of death.[4] The eucharist was also often sent by the bishop from the mother church to the other churches in the city. The country churches were too far to send it in this way, and the common practice was for presbyters to consecrate the eucharist for their own churches.

Sometimes the eucharist was consecrated in private houses for the sick, imprisoned,[5] &c.; but most commonly a portion was from time to time reserved for these purposes, from that consecrated in the

[1] Conc. Agathen. Can. 44. Conc. Aurel. i. can. 28. [2] Cypr. de Lapsis. 125. [3] Justin. Apol. ii. p. 98.—Iren. ap. Euseb. lib.v. cap. 24. [4] Conc. Nic. can. 13. [5] Cypr. Ep. 5. ad Cler. p. 11. Tertull de Fuga. cap. 11. Greg. Naz. xix. de Laud. Patris.

church. This was sometimes kept in the church, and sometimes at the houses of the ministers, to be in greater readiness for such emergencies.

Sometimes also a portion was reserved, to be used on days when no new consecration was made. This was called the *missa præ sanctiffcatorum*. It was used during a part of the days of Lent. The council of Laodicea ordered that the consecration of the eucharist should not be performed during Lent, except on Saturday and Sunday.[1] Yet it did not forbid communicating with the *before-consecrated* elements. The general reason seems to have been that the consecration service was proper only to festival days.[2] This practice obtained in the Latin church.

There is another practice which seems to be intimated by Tertullian and Cyprian, of allowing Christians to carry home a portion of the eucharist for daily private participation. This, and all such deviation from the general rule of public communion, seems to have been permitted only in reference to the times of persecution, when any individuals might be peculiarly exposed to danger from attempting to come to the public assemblies of the Church.[3]

§ 195. *The order and place of receiving the communion.*

The order in which the different sorts of communicants received the eucharist, is set down in the Apostolical Constitutions. "First let the bishop receive, then the presbyters, deacons, sub-deacons, readers, singers, and ascetics; among the women, the deaconesses, virgins, and widows: after that the children, then all the people in order."[4] In Justin Martyr's time, when the bishop had consecrated, the deacons distributed both the bread and the cup to the people:[5] but in after times, the bishop or presbyter ministered the bread, and the deacons the cup. Some canons forbid a deacon to administer the bread when a presbyter is present,[6] and the council of Nice made an express canon forbidding a presbyter to receive from the hands of a deacon.[7] It came at length to be a general custom for the deacon, by permission of the bishop, to administer the cup.

---

[1] Conc. Laod. Can. 49. [2] Leo Allet. Ep. ad Mudæum de libris Græcor. de miss. Præsanct. Smith on the Greek Ch. p. 175. [3] Tertull. ad Uxor. lib. ii. cap, 5. Cypr. de Lapsis. p. 132. [4] Const. Apost. lib. 8. cap. 13. [5] Just. Apol. ii. p. 97. [6] Conc. Arelat. ii. can. 15. [7] Conc. Nic. can. 18.

For order's sake some distinction of place was observed, varying in different churches. In general none but the superior clergy could communicate within the chancel.[1] In the Spanish churches it was customary for the presbyters and deacons to communicate at the altar, the inferior clergy in the chancel, and the people without the rails of the chancel.[2]

§ 196. *The communion received in both kinds.*

The universal practice of the primitive Church was against the modern Romish custom of denying the cup to the people. This is freely acknowledged by Cardinal Bona himself,[3] and is amply shown by various authors.[4]

The elements were also received separately, and not with the bread dipped into the wine and received together, as is the modern Greek custom. This is evident from all the ancient writings which speak of the minister's delivering the bread first with a certain form of words, and then the cup with another form.

§ 197. *Manner of Communicating.*

The communion was received sometimes standing, sometimes kneeling, but never sitting, at least the two former are the only postures ever mentioned.

The people were allowed to receive the elements into their own hands, which has been prohibited in the Romish church, since the doctrine of transubstantiation was brought in. This is confessed by many Romish writers, as indeed it is abundantly evident from all the earliest writers, to some of whom reference is made.[5]

In delivering the elements to the people, the minister used a certain form of words, to which the people answered, *Amen*. This form at first seems to have been no more than this: "*the body of Christ*," "*the blood of Christ*."[6]

---

[1] Conc. Laod. can. 19. [2] Conc. Tolet. iv. can. 17. [3] Bona, Rer. Liturg. lib. ii. cap. 18. [4] Vossius, Thes. Theol. Disp. 5 de Coena Dom. Moulin. Novelty of Popery, B. vii. contr. 12. Chamier. de Eucharist. lib. 8. cap. 9. [5] Tertull. de Coron. cap. 3. de Idololot. cap. 7.—Clem. Alex. Strom. i. p. 318. Cypr. de Lapsis. p. 132. Ep. 56 al 58. ad Thibaritan. p. 125.—Origen, Hom. 13. in Exod.—Cyril. Catech. v. n. 18. Basil. Ep. 289.—Aug. contr. Liter. Petil. lib. ii. cap. 23. [6] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 13. Cyril, Cat. v. n. 19.

In the time of Gregory the great, the form was enlarged to this: "the body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul." At a later period about the time of Charlemagne, it was used in this form: "the body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul unto everlasting life."

During the time of communicating, while the elements were being distributed, it was usual for the singers or the people to sing some suitable psalm. The Constitutions order the thirty-third psalm, chiefly on account of the words, "O taste and see how gracious the Lord is," which are found in it. Jerome intimates that the forty-fifth psalm was also sung; Augustine and Tertullian seem to refer to the one hundred and thirty-third.[1] Several other psalms are referred to by different writers, as used at this part of the communion service.

§ 198. *No elevation of the host for worship.*

The modern custom of elevating the consecrated elements for divine worship is grounded on the doctrine of transubstantiation, which declares the bread and wine to be changed into the real body and blood of Christ, and therefore to be adored. But the universal testimony of the early Christian writers shows that no such doctrine was held in the early Church. By the consecration they considered the bread and wine as not changed in substance, but only in qualities, by the super-addition of divine and mystical virtues.[2]

Not holding therefore the doctrine in question, there would be no reason for this elevation of the host for adoration. Nor is there the least mention of elevating it for any reason till the eighth century in the Greek church, when Germanus, bishop of Constantinople, mentions this custom, but says it was merely to represent the Saviour's elevation upon the cross.[3] Nor in the Latin church is any mention of this elevation made till the eleventh century, and then the same reason as above is given, but no mention of adoration is made.[4] The first writer who gives the reason of this elevation to be for the pur-

---

[1] Hieron. Ep. 28. ad Lucin. Boetie.—Aug. Retract. lib. ii. cap. 11. Tertull. Je. Jejun. cap. 13. [2] Greg. Nyss. de Bapt. Christ. tom. iii. p. 369. Chrysost. Ep. ad Cæsarium.—Theodoret. Dial. i. tom. iv. p. 17. [3] German. Theoria. Rev, Dio. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. tom. ii. p. 163. [4] Ivo. Ep. de Sacram. Missæ.

pose of adoration, is Gulielmus Durantus, who wrote about the year 1386. So that transubstantiation and adoration came in very nearly together.[1] Nor is there any mention of the ceremony of ringing a bell to give notice of the elevation of the host for worship till about this time.

Among various writers who have discussed this subject may be mentioned Daillé and Dr. Whitby. The following are the heads of the argument urged by Daillé against host worship, in his work, *De Objecto Cultus Religiosa contra Latinos.*

"1. From the silence of all ancient writers about it. 2. From their using no elevation of the Host for worship for many ages, as we have shewn at large out of Bona before. 3. The Ancients knew nothing of ringing a bell to give notice of the time of adoration to the people. 4. There are no histories of beasts miraculously worshipping the eucharist, which sort of fictions are so common in later ages. 5. The Ancients never carried the eucharist to the sick or absent with any pomp or signs of worship; never exposed it to public view in times of solemn rejoicing or sorrow; never adored or invoked its assistance in distress, or upon any great undertaking; which are now such common practices in the Roman church. 6. The Ancients never enjoined persons newly baptized and penitents to fall down before the eucharist and worship it, as is now commonly done in the Roman church. 7. The Ancients never allowed non-communicants to stay and worship the eucharist, as the practice now is; which yet had been very proper, had they believed the eucharist to be their God. But they used it only for communion, not for adoration. 8. The Ancients never used to carry the eucharist publicly in processions, to be adored by all the people; which is a novel practice in the judgment of Krantzius and Cassander. 9. The Ancients lighted no lamps nor candles by day to the eucharist, nor burned incense before it, as is now the practice. 10. They made no little images of the eucharist, to be kissed and worshipped as the images of Christ. 11. They had no peculiar festival appropriated to its more solemn worship. This is of no longer date than Pope Urban IV., who first instituted it, Anno 1264, and it is peculiar only to the Roman church. 12. The ancient Liturgies have no forms

[1] Gul. Durant. Rationale, lib. iv. de parte 6. Canonis. Dallæ de Objecto Cultus. lib. ii. cap. 6.

of prayers, doxologies, or praises to the eucharist, as are in the Roman Missal. 13. The adoration of the eucharist, was never objected by the heathens to the primitive Christians; nor were they reproached, as the Romanists have been since, as eaters of their God. It is a noted saying of Averroes, '*Quando quidem comedunt Christiani quod colunt, sit anima mea cum philosophis,—Since Christians eat what they worship, let my soul rather have her portion among the philosophers.*' This learned philosopher lived about the year 1150, when the Host-worship began to be practiced, which gave him this prejudice to the Christian religion. 14. The Christians objected such things to the Heathens, as they never would have objected, had they themselves worshipped the Host; as, that it was an impious thing to eat what they worshipped, and worship what they eat and sacrificed. Which objections might easily have been retorted upon them. 15. The Christians were accused by the Heathens of eating infants' blood in their solemn mysteries, but never any mention is made of eating the blood of Christ, either in the objection or answer to it. The ground of the story arose from the practice of the Carpocratians and other heretics, and not from the Christians eating the blood of Christ. 16. Lastly, the Christians never urged the adoration of the eucharist in their disputes with the Ebionites and Docetæ, which yet would have been very proper to confute their errors, who denied the reality of the flesh of Christ.

To these arguments of Mr. Daillé, Dr. Whitby in his book on the Idolatry of Host-worship, has added these further. 1. That the Scriptures and Fathers deride the heathen deities, and say, that we may know they are no Gods, because they have no use of their outward senses. 2. Because they are made Gods by consecration, and by the will of the artificer, part of that matter, which is consecrated into a God, being exposed to common uses. 3. Because they were imprisoned in their images, or shut up in obscure habitations. 4. Because they clothed their Gods in costly raiments. 5. Because they might be metamorphosed or changed from one shape to another. All which might have been retorted upon the Christians, had they worshipped the eucharist, without any possibility of evasion. Soto and Paludanus own, that the whole eucharist, substance as well as species, may be vomited up again, or voided at the draught. Which to affirm of the real body of Christ, the Ancients would have accounted the greatest blasphemy."

§ 199. *Post-Communion service.*

After the people had communicated, and the remainder of the elements had been removed to the place appropriated for them, the deacon called upon the people to return thanks. The exhortation is given in the Constitutions in these words :[1] "Now that we have received the precious body and the precious blood of Christ, let us give thanks to Him that hath vouchsafed to make us partakers of his holy mysteries; and let us beseech him that they may not be to our condemnation, but salvation, for the benefit of our soul and body, for the preservation of us in piety, for the remission of our sins, and for the obtaining of the life of the world to come." Then he bids them rise up and commend themselves to God; and thereupon the bishop offers the following commendatory prayer:

"O Lord God Almighty, the Father of thy Christ, thy blessed Son; who hearest those, that with an upright heart call upon Thee, who knowest the supplications of those, that in silence pray unto Thee; we give Thee thanks for that Thou hast vouchsafed to make us partakers of thy holy mysteries, which thou hast given us for the confirmation or full assurance of those things, which we stedfastly believe and know, for the preservation of our piety, for the remission of our sins; because the name of thy Christ is called upon us, and we are united unto Thee. Thou that hast separated us from the communion of the ungodly, unite us with them that are sanctified unto Thee; confirm us in Thy truth by the coming of Thy Holy Spirit and his resting upon us; reveal unto us what things we are ignorant of, supply what we are deficient in, and strengthen us in what we know. Preserve thy priest unblamable in thy service, keep our princes in peace, our governors in righteousness, the air in good temperature, the fruits of the earth in plenty, and the whole world by thy Almighty providence. Pacify the nations that are inclined to war; convert those that go astray; sanctify Thy people; preserve those that are in virginity; keep those that are married in thy faith; strengthen those that are in chastity; bring infants to mature age; confirm those that are newly baptized; instruct the catechumens, and make them fit and worthy of baptism; and gather us all into the kingdom of heaven, through Jesus Christ

[1] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 14.

our Lord, with whom unto Thee and the Holy Spirit be glory, honour, and adoration, world without end. Amen."

Then the deacon called the people to bow down their heads to receive the benediction, which the bishop gave in these words: "Almighty God, and True, with whom no one can compare, who art every where, and present unto all, yet not in them as things of which they consist, who art circumscribed by no place, not grown old with time, nor bounded by ages; who art without generation, and needest no preserver; who art above all corruption, incapable of change, and unalterable by nature; that dwellest in light which no one can approach unto, and art invisible by nature; that art known to all rational natures, that seek Thee with an upright heart, and art apprehended by those that search after Thee with a pure mind; O thou God of Israel, the Israel, that truly sees Thee, and the people, that believes in Christ, show thyself propitious, and hear me for thy name's sake; Bless this people, that bow their necks unto Thee, and grant them the petitions of their heart, that are expedient for them, and suffer none of them to fall from thy kingdom; but sanctify them, keep and protect, help and deliver them from the adversary, and from every enemy; preserve their houses, and defend their going out and their coming in: for to Thee belongs glory, praise, majesty, worship and adoration: and to thy son Jesus, thy Christ, our Lord, and God, and king; and to the Holy Spirit, now and for ever, world without end. Amen."

Then the deacon dismissed the assembly with the usual form, "*Go in peace*," which was considered as a solemn form of prayer.

§ 200. *Disposition of the remains of the eucharist.*

Some portions of the consecrated elements, as has been observed, were kept for special purposes, to be sent to the sick, &c. This portion the Constitutions order the deacon to carry to the *pastophoria* or vestry. If any thing beyond what was needed for these uses was left after the people had communicated, it was divided among the communicants and reverently eaten on the spot—or in some places given to innocent children—and in some places burnt in the fire.[1]

---

[1] Theophil. can. viii. Conc. Matiscon. ii. can. 6. Hesych. in Levit. lib. ii.

§ 201. *Disposition of the other offerings of the people; Agapæ or Love-Feasts.*

The distribution of the remains of the consecrated elements must not be confounded with the distribution made of the other oblations. These latter offerings of the people as has been stated, were in part distributed among the clergy for their maintenance, or went to form a fund for the uses of the Church.

But a portion of them went also to form a common entertainment for the communicants. To this entertainment the rich contributed liberally, according to their ability, and all partook in common. These feasts were called *Agapæ* or *love-feasts*. Chrysostom derives them from Apostolical practice, and says it was a custom that always accompanied the communion.[1] So Jerome, Theodoret, and others.[2]

Whether the love-feast preceded or followed the communion, is a point on which different opinions have been held. Chrysostom and other ancient writers speak of it as following the communion. Some modern writers say it preceded it, in imitation of the Saviour's institution of the eucharist after supper. But it is not likely that in the times of persecution, when the communion was celebrated very early in the morning, the *Agape* would come before it. Accordingly, Tertullian describes it as a supper, and coming after the communion. His account is quite particular.[3] "Our supper" says he, "shows its reason in its very name; for it is called ἀγάπη, which signifies *love* among the Greeks. Whatever charge we are at, it is gain to be at expense upon the account of piety. For therewith we relieve and refresh the poor. There is nothing vile or immodest committed in it. For we do not sit down before we have first offered up prayer to God; we eat only to satisfy hunger, and drink only so much as becomes modest persons. We fill ourselves in such manner as that we remember still that we are to worship God at night. We discourse as in the presence of God, knowing that he hears us. Then after water to wash our hands, and lights brought in, every one is moved to sing some hymn to God, either out of

---

[1] Chrysost. Hom. 27 in 1 Cor. [2] Hieron. in 1 Cor. xi. 20. Theod. in 1 Cor. xi. 16. [3] Tertull. Apol. cap. 39.

Scripture, or as he is able, of his own composition; and by this we judge whether he has observed the rules of temperance in drinking. Prayer again concludes the feast: and thence we depart, not to fight and quarrel, not to run about and abuse all we meet, not to give ourselves up to lascivious pastime, but to pursue some care of modesty and chastity, as men that have fed at a supper of philosophy and discipline, rather than a corporeal feast."

It came to be a very general custom in the Church, to receive the eucharist fasting in the morning, which would naturally bring the *Agapæ* at a later period of the day.

These love-feasts, as designed for the promotion of unity and charity, were commonly held in the Church for the three first centuries.[1] As however, they exposed the Christians to some calumny, and were liable to abuses, the holding of them in the Church, was forbidden by the council of Laodicea.[2] The custom prevailed however, more or less, in various places, till the seventh century.

§ 202. *The preparation for worthy communicating required by the ancient Church.*

In general the early Church strenuously insisted on a hearty compliance with all the baptismal vows—and instructed all who would partake of the holy mystery of the eucharist, that they should habitually cherish the spirit of true repentance, lively faith in Christ, and hearty obedience to the holy precepts of the Gospel; and thus live in a state of continual preparation for a sacrament, which was so frequently celebrated.

Yet knowing the frailty of our imperfect nature, they made a distinction between those sins which cleave to the best Christian, and gross or allowed and habitual sins; and taught that where there was an habitual upright and sincere desire and effort to obey and please Christ, none should scruple to come to the holy table, on account of those daily infirmities and sins which beset them, provided they were humbly repentant, and truly desirous of attaining a more perfect conformity to the will of God; and to this end honestly used all the means of grace,—watchfulness, mortification, and prayer.[3]

---

[1] Conc. Gangr. can. 11. Bevereg. Not. in Conc. Trull. can. 74. Suicer, tom. 1. p. 27. [2] Conc. Laod. can. 28. [3] August. de Symboli. lib. 1. cap. 7.

Augustine makes a threefold distinction of sins. 1. Such great sins for which men did public penance. 2. Such great sins as deserved to be corrected and punished with severe reproof, though they did not bring men under public penance; such as anger, and evil speaking. 3. Sins of human frailty and daily incursion, for which daily prayer was the daily medicine.[1]

All who were guilty of the greater sins were required to make public confession, and all those known to the Church as guilty of such sins were put under penance, and debarred the communion till they had given satisfactory evidence of repentance.

Although the Church sometimes advised to the public confession of private crimes, yet she laid no necessity upon the conscience in this respect—neither requiring any public or private confession, save to God alone. And in the practice of the ancient Christians, their confessions were all voluntary and made with a view to public penance; and the Church never enjoined auricular confession in order to private absolution.—To be in peace and charity with all mankind was specially insisted on as necessary to worthy communication.

§ 203. *Of frequent Communion.*

Anciently all baptized persons, except penitents under censure, were required to receive the communion every Sunday. The Apostolical Canons say: "if any bishop, presbyter, or deacon, or any other of the clergy, does not communicate, when the oblation is offered, let him show cause why he does not, that if it be a reasonable cause, he may be excused; but if he show no cause, let him be excommunicated, as giving scandal to the people, and raising suspicion against him that offers."[2] And again; "if any of the faithful come to Church to hear the Scriptures read, and stay not to join in the prayers and receive the communion, let them be excommunicated, as the author of disorder in the Church." The Council of Antioch has a canon to the same effect.[3] All the ancient canons and writers that describe the order of divine service, speak of the communion as celebrated every Sunday, and of the obligation of all the faithful not under penance, to partake of it. This continued to be

---

[1] August. de Fide et Oper. cap. 26. [2] Can. Apost. can. 8, 9. [3] Conc. Antioch. can. 2.

the practice of the Church for the first three centuries, as is clear from the writings of Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Chrysostom.[1] So general indeed was this custom that Sunday was called *dies panis, the day of bread.*

Besides Sunday, it was frequently celebrated on other days—particularly on the anniversaries of martyrs, all the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost, on the stationary days, that is on Wednesdays and Fridays, and in some churches on Saturday.[2] From all the writers referred to, it appears plain that it was a very general custom to celebrate the communion three times every week, on Sunday, Wednesday, and Friday,—and many churches on Saturday also, making four times a week.

In some places, moreover, the communion was received every day. Thus Augustine says: "the sacrament of his body, is in some places prepared and taken every day; in other places, only on certain days, with an interval of time between them."[3] In another place he says, "those that communicated the seldomest, did it at least every Lord's day."[4] The probability is that those churches where it was celebrated every day, were the large city churches, and that in general the mother churches, and large city churches, had the communion the most frequently, while smaller churches and those in the country, where it was less easy for the people to assemble, had it less frequently, though in all cases as often as once a week. Cyprian, and Augustine after him, speak of it as the custom of the church of Carthage, to celebrate the communion every day; and Jerome says the same of the church of Rome, and of the Spanish church.[5]

Gradually however, the frequency of attendance at communion, relaxed. In the time of Chrysostom, it appears that many began

---

[1] Ignat. Ep. ad Ephes. n. 13. Justin. Apol. ii. p. 97. Clem. Alex. Strom. 1. p. 318. Bp. Taylor's Const. Commun. p. 462. Chrys. tom. v. de Resur. [2] Tertull. de Con. Mil. cap. 3. de Orat. cap. 14.—Basil. Ep. 219. Socrat. lib. v. cap. 22. Cypr. Ep. 12. al. 37. Ep. 39. al. 34. Chrysost. Hom. 59. de martyr. Sidom. Apollinar. lib. v. Ep. 17. Socrat. lib. vi. cap. 8. Basil. Ep. 289. Const. Apost. lib. ii. cap. 59. [3] August. Tract. 26. in Joh. p. 94. [4] August. Ep. 118. ad Januar. cap. ii. [5] Cyprian. de Orat. Dom. p. 147. Ep. 36 al. 38 ad Thibaritanos. p. 125. Ep. 54. al 57. ad Cornel. August. de Dono Persever. cap. 5. Hieron. Ep. 1. ad Pammach. contr. Jovin. cap. 6. Ep. 28 ad Lucin. Boetec.

scandalously to neglect this sacrament, contenting themselves with coming to it once or twice a year, upon some solemn festival. But the Church still censured this negligence, and kept up the custom of daily communion in some places, in many places four times a week, and in all places twice a week, on Saturdays, and Sundays; and the clergy and devout laity were still constant attendants, while those who were negligent were rebuked and exhorted.

At length, however, some councils instead of endeavouring to revive the ancient discipline, gave in to the degeneracy of the times, and contented themselves with imposing upon the laity the obligation of receiving the communion at three settled times in the year—the festivals of Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost. This was first enacted by the council of Agde, about the year 506, and confirmed by other councils[1] The council of Aix la Chappelle, in the ninth century, made an attempt to revive the ancient practice, by re-enacting the canon of the council of Antioch, ordering the excommunication of such as come to church without joining in the communion.[2] The neglect of this sacrament, however, continued and increased, till at last the council of Lateran, 1215, reduced the obligation of communicating to once a year, at Easter.[3]

---

[1] Conc. Agathen. can. 18. Conc. Turon. iii. can. 50. [2] Conc. Aquisgran. cap. 70. [3] Conc. Lateran. iv. can. 21. See in the Appendix some account of attempts made at the Reformation to revive frequent communion.

BOOK SIXTH.

CHAPTER FIRST.

OF THE UNITY OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

§ 204. *Of the spiritual union and communion necessary to the being of the Church.*

The unity of the Church as one mystical body united under one head, Christ, was greatly insisted on by the early Christians. And as fundamentally necessary to this they required, a unity of *faith* in the doctrines of the gospel,—a unity of holy *obedience* to the laws and institutions of Christ,—and lastly a unity of *brotherly love*, and charity among all the members of the Church.[1] Hence it was that in the initiatory sacrament of Christianity—baptism, they admitted none to the communion of the Church without making a profession of the primary articles of the Christian faith, and a solemn covenant to live in holy obedience to the laws and institutions of Christ.

The fundamental Articles of Faith, necessary to the unity and proper being of the Church, they summed up in the creeds used in baptism. These were the *canon*, the *regular fidei*, the *rule of faith*, or *standard* by which to determine orthodoxy and heresy. If any man deviated from these, he was deemed to have cut himself off from the unity and communion of the Church, as an heretical person, by deserting the common faith.[2] Hence, says Clemens Alexandrinus,[3] out of Hermes Pastor, "faith is the virtue that binds and unites the Church together." Thus Hegesippus, the ancient historian, says "they divided the unity of the Church, by denying some of the prime, fundamental articles of faith; and he that makes a breach upon any one of these cannot maintain the unity of the Church,

---

[1] Angust. de Unit. Eccles. cap. 21. Idem. contr. Crescon. lib. 1. &c.
[2] Ep. Conc. Antioch. ap. Euseb. lib. vii. cap. 30. Iren. lib. i. cap. 1. Ibid. cap. iii. Tertull. de Veland Virg. cap. 1. Idem. de Præscript. cap. 13. Cypr. Ep. 69. al 76. Hieron. Ep. 54. ad Marcellam. [3] Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. ii. p. 458.

nor his own character as a Christian.[1] "Therefore," says Cyprian, "we ought in all things to hold the unity of the Catholic Church, and not to yield any thing to the enemies of faith and truth. For he cannot be thought a Christian, who continues not in the truth of Christ's gospel and faith."[2] "If men be heretics," says Tertullian, "they cannot be Christians."[3] To the same effect Sactantius, Jerome, Athanasius, Hilary, and other ancient writers.

The other point—holy obedience to the laws and institutions of Christ—which was reckoned essential to being a Christian, and necessary to the proper unity of the Church—was equally insisted on in the baptismal covenant. Those who were unholy in heart or life, however they might be visibly united to the Church, yet internally and spiritually they were divided from it. Thus Augustine says: "that though men were regenerated by baptism, yet none but the good were spiritually built up into the body and members of Christ; the good only compose that Church, of which it is said, 'as the lily among thorns, so is my love among the daughters.' That Church consists only of those, who build upon the rock, that is, who hear Christ's words and do them. They therefore are not of that Church, who build upon the sand, that is, who hear the words of Christ, and do them not."[4] Again,[5] speaking of the grace of the Spirit, he says, "this is wanting in all the wicked, and sons of hell, although they be baptized with the baptism of Christ, as Simon Magus was baptized." Many other passages of the same kind are scattered through his work.

Finally, they insisted specially upon brotherly love and charity, as an essential part of that holy Christian obedience, which was necessary to the unity of the Church. "I do not think any man," says Augustine, "so foolish as to believe one to appertain to the unity of the Church, who has not charity." And again: "they that are enemies to this brotherly charity, whether they are openly out of the Church, or seem to be within, they are false Christians and antichrists. When they seem to be within, they are separated from that invisible union, or bond of charity."[6]

---

[1] Hegesip. ap. Eusb. lib. iv. cap. 22. [2] Cypr. 71. ad Quint. p. 194. de Unit. Eccles. de. 114. [3] Tertull. de Præscript. cap. 37. [4] August. de Unit. Eccles. cap. 21. [5] Idem. de Unit. cap. 22. [6] August. contr. Crescon. lib. i. cap. 29. de Bapt. lib. iii. cap. 19.

§ 205. *The unity necessary to the well-being of the Church; and first of baptism.*

Besides the above things fundamental to the spiritual being of the Church, there were other things requisite to the well-being of the Church, in regard to which the duty of unity was enjoined;—yet not so as that a deviation from them necessarily in all cases incurred the censure of the Church, and excluded from her communion.

Those things in which unity was regarded as necessary to the well-being of the Church, and not to be dispensed with, except in extraordinary cases, were:

1. *One baptism.*—That all should be baptized—that this should be performed in the one scriptural form—and by the hands of a regular ministry. All wilful and unnecessary departures from this rule, involved the guilt of schism. The extent and limitations of this rule, have been already shown in treating of baptism.

§ 206. *Unity of worship.*

2. Unity of worship, and a constant and regular attendance upon the public prayers, preaching, and sacraments of the Church, to which each one belonged, was also required. All who did contrary to this, except in extraordinary cases, and for good and necessary reasons, were censured, or excommunicated, as separatists, and schismatics.[1] So careful indeed was the Church to preserve unity in this respect, that we find it decreed in the canons of various early councils, that any person, being at home in his own city, and absenting himself from church three successive Sundays, without being prevented by sickness, or other good reason, should be suspended an equal time from communion, or, as some canons have it, should be excommunicated.[2]

§ 207. *The unity of subordination and obedience to the bishop.*

3. We may mention thirdly, the unity that was required by the subordination of the clergy and people under one bishop, paying him all due respect and obedience. Thus says Cyprian: "the

[1] Conc. Gangr. can. 4, 5, 6, 11, 18, 19, 20. Can. Apost. 7, 31. Conc. Antioch. can. 2. Eliber. can. 28. [2] Conc. Eliber. can. 21. Conc. Sardic. can. 11. Conc. Trull. can. 80.

Church is a people united to their bishop—a flock adhering to their pastor."[1] And he adds, that the bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the bishop, and that whoever are not with the bishop are not in the Church, that is, those who wilfully withdraw from his communion, and set up one in opposition to him. Hence when some *lapsers*, (as those who apostatized in times of persecution, were called) wrote to him, styling themselves a church, he sternly replied that "he could not but wonder at their temerity, when it was so plain by divine law, that a church consisted of a bishop and clergy, together with a people, standing firm without lapsing in time of persecution.[2] He also severely rebukes those presbyters, who took upon themselves by their own authority, without permission or direction from the bishop, to reconcile lapsers; this he tells them was to forget the rules of the gospel and their own station.[3] It was an ancient rule of the Church, that presbyters should in all their ministerial offices act in dependence upon, and subordination to the bishop. Hence Cyprian says: "it is the first beginning of heretics, the first rise and attempt of schismatics, men of evil dispositions, to please themselves, and with a swelling pride contemn the bishop that is set over them," &c. "Most heresies and schisms take their birth from this original, that men refuse to submit to the bishop appointed by God, &c."[4]

This obedience was, however, due to the bishop only on supposition of his authority being lawfully settled by the rules of the Church; for although duly consecrated, he might in various ways become divested of his office, and of lawful authority.

And as the clergy and laity were to preserve the unity of the Church by obedience to the bishop, so again were the laity obliged to due respect and obedience to all persons belonging to the sacred office.

§ 208. *Unity of submission to the Discipline of the Church.*

4. It may be stated fourthly, that the Church required every member to submit to the rules of discipline appointed for the punishment

---

[1] Cypr. 69 al. 66. ad Florent. p. 168. [2] Cypr. Ep. 27 al. 33. ad Lapsos. [3] Id. Ep. 10. al. 16. ad Clerum. [4] Cypr. Ep. 65 al. 3. ad Rogot. p. 6. Ep. 55 al. 69 ad Cornel. p. 129.

of delinquents, for their restoration through penitence, and for the dignity of the Church. This discipline no one was to despise, or resist, but meekly to submit thereto; none were to seek clandestinely to be restored to the full communion of any other church, before satisfaction made to that which he especially belonged: and none should separate himself from the communion of the Catholic Church and go to schismatical conventicles on account of discipline. Unless offenders submitted to the discipline of the Church and sought to be reconciled to it by the ordinary and prescribed rules of confession and repentance, they were counted grievous despisers of Christ's Church, and dying in such a state, no funeral service or commemorations, such as were had for those who died in the peace of the Church, were allowed to be performed.

§ 209. *Communion of different churches forming the unity of the Catholic Church.*

Thus far the unity of every church with relation to its own members has been considered. It remains now to notice how the different churches were held together in union and communion as one holy, Apostolic, Catholic Church.

This was done first by the unity of a common faith; for although each bishop had his own creed and liturgy in so far as regarded the form of words, yet all the creeds and offices were to express substantially the same faith—including all the fundamental articles, necessary to the being of a Christian and to the being of a Church. All churches which departed from this rule, were held as heretical conventicles; and to secure the requisite unity of faith, every bishop at his ordination made a declaration of his faith before the provincial synod and also sent circular letters to other churches to signify that he was in communion with the Catholic Church.

In the second place, the churches were required to give each other mutual assistance in opposing fundamental errours, and in preserving the common faith. In this respect the whole world was but one diocese, and every bishop had a common concern in the whole.

Thirdly, the unity of the Catholic Church was to be maintained by each church, and every member, joining, in communion with all the other churches, in divine worship and all holy offices. To this end it was requisite that every church should keep its Liturgy free from superstitious and idolatrous worship, and conformable to the

analogy of the fundamental articles of the Christian faith; and on the other hand that every Christian, when he came to a foreign church, should readily comply with all the usages and rules of that church in regard to those indifferent matters which each bishop and church were left to regulate according to their views of edification and general expediency. This was a necessary rule of peace and unity: for there would naturally be a greater or less diversity of customs and forms in things indifferent.

Fourthly, the unity of the Catholic Church was farther preserved by the mutual consent of the churches, to ratify all legal acts of discipline exercised by any particular church. A person in regular communion with one church, had a right, when travelling, to the privileges of other churches, if he carried with him his commendatory letters, (*litteræ formatæ*) to signify that he was in peace and communion with his church. On the other hand, if a man was excommunicated or suspended in his own church, no other church would admit him to communion, till he had reconciled himself to his church.[1]

Fifthly, the unity of the Catholic Church was farther preserved by the submission of all the churches to the *common law*, as it may be called, of the Church, to that namely, which by general consent, was handed down from Apostolical tradition, and to that which was settled by the determination of general councils![2]

The foregoing things being duly adhered to, we find no such notion in the ancient Church, as the necessity of a single visible head of the Catholic Church. Nor did the ancient Church deem it necessary that there should be perfect uniformity in all the rites and ceremonies of every church; but in things indifferent left room for diversity of usage, except where either universal tradition, or a decree of a general council had determined the matter. Thus Irenæus, speaking of the different customs of several churches, in regard to the Lent fast, says, "we still retain peace with one another; and the different ways of keeping the fast only the more commends our agreement in the faith."[3]

---

[1] Optat. lib. ii. p. 48. Epiphan. Haer. 42. Marcion. 1. [2] August. Ep. 118. ad. Januar. [3] Iren. ap. Euseb. lib. v. cap. 24.

So likewise, Augustine says, "that all such things, whereabout the Scripture has given no positive determination, the custom of the people of God, or the rules of our forefathers, are to be taken for laws. For if we dispute about such matters, and condemn the custom of one church, by the custom of another, that will be an eternal occasion of strife and contention."[1]

Not only did this liberty of differing extend to matters of mere rituals, but we find several weightier questions candidly and moderately debated, and in regard to which different practices obtained, yet without the union and communion of the Church being broken; such as the receiving or not receiving of those baptized by heretics and schismatics, clinic baptism, &c.[2]

Allowance was also made for those Christians who with honest minds, but out of ignorance broke communion with each other, on account of things indifferent, or disputes merely verbal. In such cases the Church had compassion on the parties, and endeavoured to compose the difference and bring about a right understanding. Thus Nazianzen tells us of the dispute about the use of the words *persons*, and *hypostases*, in regard to the Trinity, which at one time ran very high, one party charging the other with Arianism, and other with Sabellianism—though both meant the same thing. And he reckons it greatly to the praise of Athanasius, that by his wisdom and prudence he composed this strife.[3]

The Church aimed as far as practicable to make a distinction between heresiarchs, the authors and leaders of heresy, and those who might ignorantly be drawn in by them; nevertheless as she could not know the hearts of men, she was forced, as a general rule, to judge of men's unity by their external profession and conduct. And though there might be different degrees of deviation from the unity of the Church, yet the Church regarded none as in perfect unity, except such as were in full communion. Still it is necessary in reading the ancient writers, to bear in mind the distinction between perfect communion and that partial unity which was formed by baptism and other things of common agreement, while yet there was more or less of separation and schism in other respects.

---

[1] August. Ep. 86. ad Casulan. [2] Barrow, of the unity of the Church. p. 299. Potter, Answer to Charity Mistaken. Sect. iii. p. 88. [3] Greg. Naz. Orat. 21, de laud. Athanas.

CHAPTER SECOND.

OF THE DISCIPLINE OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

§ 210. *The general nature and intention of discipline.*

The discipline of the Church was exercised only upon such as were in some sense in the Church by an act of their own. This included the baptized and candidates for baptism. In regard to the baptized, when incurring discipline, the Church never cancelled their first baptism, and required another as the means of reconciliation to its communion.

But the disciplinary power of the Church was exerted in depriving delinquents of all the benefits and privileges usually connected with baptism; by debarring them from the eucharist, the prayers, sermons, and other offices of public worship. Sometimes they were forbidden even to enter the Church; and the faithful were required to hold no communication with them even in common conversation; in short they were more or less completely cut off from all brotherly communion, till they showed signs of humility and penitence. The object of all the various modes and parts of discipline was the preservation of peace and purity of the Church and the good of offenders.

§ 211. *The power of the Church originally only spiritual.*

The disciplinary power of the Church was purely spiritual; she claimed no right over men's bodies, or estates; except that in regard to the latter, she claimed the right of resuming donations of property made by herself for purely ecclesiastical purposes, when those to whom they had been entrusted were contumacious and came under censure. In such cases she sometimes craved the assistance of the secular power, even whilst it was heathen, and more frequently after the state became Christian. An instance of this sort is recorded in Eusebius, where a deposed clergyman at Antioch, refused to give up the house belonging to the Church; application was made to Aurelian, the Emperor, who caused the man to be ejected.[1] After the

[1] Euseb. lib. vii. cap. 30.

Emperors became Christian, this was more common. The council of Antioch, in the year 341, made a canon, "that if a presbyter, who set up a separate meeting against his bishop, and was after admonition, deposed for this, still continued obstinately to disturb and subvert the Church, he should be corrected by the external power, that is by the civil magistrate as a seditious person."[1] In the canons of some of the councils of Carthage, and in the African code, are similar enactments.[2] But the original idea and intention, in bringing in the secular to the aid of the spiritual power, was mainly to protect the Church against violence and to secure it in the due enjoyment of its spiritual and temporal rights, and in the exercise of its spiritual powers. And beyond this she sometimes, during the early ages, did indeed avail herself of secular power to give additional effect to her censures.

But it is to be noted that the Church never thought it just or right to require or countenance the civil power to go so far as to punish with life or blood, any mere error, or ecclesiastical misdemeanor. There were indeed, some laws subjecting heretics to capital punishment, or other personal severities, made by Theodosius and some emperors; but they were rarely put in execution. "For no good men in the Catholic Church," says Augustine, "are pleased to have any one, although he be an heretic, persecuted unto the death."[3] And oftener, even in the case of malefactors, did the bishops intercede with the civil power for mercy on delinquents.

Nor was it any part of ancient discipline to deprive men of their natural or civil rights, much less magistrates and kings of the power and allegiance belonging to them. Although there is no question but the Church used her spiritual power of discipline over kings and princes, as well as over other members of her communion; yet there is no ground in the practice of the early Church for the Romish usurpations, which arrogate the right of deposing excommunicated princes, absolving their subjects from allegiance, &c.

---

[1] Conc. Antioch. can. 5. [2] Conc. Carth. iii. can. 38. Cod. Afric. can. 49. 54. 68. 95. [3] August. Contr. Crescon. lib. iii. cap. 50.

§ 212. *In what the discipline of the Church consisted; first, in admonition.*

The discipline of the Church as a spiritual power, was limited to the following things: 1. A solemn admonition of the offender, which was commonly repeated once or twice before they proceeded further. This was called προθεσμία, *the warning*,[1] and was sometimes limited to the space of ten days, before further proceedings were made.[2] Ambrose says: "a putrified member of the body is never cut off but with grief, we try a long time whether it cannot be healed with medicines; if not, then a good physician cuts it off. Such is the affection of a good bishop: he is very desirous first to heal the infirm, and not cut off: at last he cuts off with grief what cannot be healed."[3]

§ 213. *Suspension or the lesser Excommunication.*

If the admonitions proved ineffectual, the Church proceeded to greater severities. The suspension, or lesser excommunications, commonly called ἀφορισμὸς, consisted in excluding men from partaking the eucharist and from the prayers of the faithful; but it did not expel them from the Church, nor deny them the privilege of being present at the ante-communion service.

This punishment was commonly inflicted for the lesser crimes, or if for greater, upon such persons as showed an immediate disposition to submit to the laws of penance. The council of Eliberis orders this punishment to be inflicted for three weeks upon such as neglected public worship for the like period.[4] There was also a still lesser kind of this suspension sometimes imposed, by which they were excluded only from partaking the eucharist, but still permitted to be present as spectators.

§ 214. *The greater Excommunication and its effects.*

The greater excommunication was the cutting men off from all communion in the holy offices of the Church. Hence it is called in

---

[1] Habert. Archierat. p. 789. [2] Celestin. Ep. ad Nestor. [3] Ambros. de Offic. lib. ii. cap. 27. [4] Conc. Eliber. can 21.

the ancient canons παντελὴς ἀφορισμὸς, *the total separation*, and also *anathema*, *the curse*, as being the greatest curse that could be laid upon a man. It is also spoken of in various phraseologies which signify being wholly cast out and cast off by the Church. A form of this sort of excommunication is found in Synesius, as pronounced against Andronicus, the wicked and tyrannical governor of Ptolemais:[1] "now that the man is no longer to be admonished, but cut off as an incurable member, the church of Ptolemais makes this declaration or injunction to all her sister churches throughout the world: let no church of God, be open to Andronicus and his accomplices; to Thoas and his accomplices; but let every sacred temple and sanctuary be shut against them. The devil has no part in paradise; though he privily creep in, he is driven out again. I therefore admonish both private men and magistrates, neither to receive them under their roof, nor to their table; and priests more especially, that they neither converse with them living, nor attend their funerals when dead. And if any one despise this church, as being only a small city, and receive those that are excommunicated by her, as if there was no necessity of observing the rules of a poor church; let them know, that they divide the Church by schism which Christ would have to be one. And whoever does so, whether he be deacon, presbyter or bishop, shall be ranked in the same class with Andronicus; we will neither give them the right hand of fellowship, nor eat at the same table with them; much less will communicate in the sacred mysteries with them who choose to have part with Andronicus and Thoas."

This form leads us to notice several things which were immediate consequences of the greater excommunication. 1. As soon as one, by it, was struck off from the list of his own church, notice was given to the neighbouring churches, and sometimes to the churches all over the world. This is ordered by the council of Toledo, and was the uniform practice; and especially was it held to be an important thing for all councils to send synodical letters over the world to apprise the churches what heresies had been condemned and what heretics excommunicated.

2. And such was the harmony which prevailed in the Catholic

[1] Synes. Ep. 58. p. 199.

Church, that every church ratified the lawful doings of every other; so that he who was excommunicated by one church, was held to be excommunicate in all churches—until he had been restored to communion in his own church; and nothing could invalidate this rule but the act of a synod, to which individuals had always the right of appeal. This was the uniform law of the Church. Thus the Apostolical Canons: "if any presbyter or deacon is suspended from communion by his bishop, he shall not be received by any other but the bishop that suspended him, except in case that bishop chance to die."[1] And again: "if any clergyman or layman, who is cast out of the Church, be received in another city without commendatory letters, both he that received him, and he that is so received, shall be cast out of the communion."[2] The council of Nice is supposed to refer to these canons, when it passed one to the same effect.[3] The councils of Antioch, of Eliberis, of Sardis, of Arles, and others have similar decrees.[4]

3. Moreover, all such excommunicated persons were to be debarred from social communion with the Church. Ministers and Christians were not to receive them into their houses, nor to eat with them, nor to converse with them familiarly, nor to perform the offices of Christian burial for them when they died. These rules were founded upon the Scriptural passage in 1 Cor. v. 11. Rom. xvi. 17. 2 Thess. iii. 14. 2 John, 10, 11. Hence in all the early councils we find these rules enacted, and they were uniformly observed with great strictness. The object of this strictness in avoiding all fellowship, social as well as religious, with the excommunicated, was first, to make them ashamed, and lead to reflection and penitence; second, to deter by their example others from sin.

§ 215. *Other effects of excommunication.*

As a further indication of the separation of such persons from all communion with the faithful, it was forbidden that any gifts or oblations should be received from the excommunicated; nor, where it was practicable to cast them away, would the Church retain such as had been made before they were excommunicated.[5]

---

[1] Can. Apost. 32. [2] Ibid. can. 13. [3] Conc. Nic. can. 5. [4] Conc. Antioch. can. 6. Eliber. can. 53. Sardic. can. 13. Arelat. i. can. 16. [5] Tertull. de Præscript. cap. 30.

Again, the council of Laodicea, forbids all persons to attend any religious meetings of the excommunicated heretics, or to receive any presents from them under the name of *eulogiæ*, because these *eulogiæ* were a sort of consecrated loaves, the reception or participation of which, was a sort of fellowship.[1] The same council also forbids all Christians to form any alliances by marriage, with heretics.[2] Other laws forbid the reading of their books, and required them to be burned, except as it might be requisite for bishops and suitable persons to read in order to confute them, or to derive aid from them in defending or explaining the Catholic faith.[3]

§ 216. *Of the phrase "Delivering unto Satan," of the Anathema Maranatha, and of Execrations.*

The power of delivering unto satan, whatever it might imply beyond excommunication, was held to be an extraordinary power, exclusively confined to the first apostles; and we do not find the words in any ancient form of excommunication. The canons very rarely use it, and where it is used it seems to mean no more than excommunication, or total cutting off from the Church.

The word *anathema, let him be accursed*, is frequently found in the canons, in the condemnation of heretics, where it means simply excommunication. The phrase *anathema maranatha* is seldom found; nor was it a part of the form of excommunication.

Execrating, or imprecating calamity and destruction upon the excommunicated, was sometimes practised, yet the general sense of the Church was against it. Chrysostom has a whole homily upon this subject, the conclusion of which is, "that we ought only to anathematize the impious and heretical opinions of men, but spare their persons, and pray for their salvation."[4]

---

[1] Conc. Laod. can. 9. 33. 34. 32. [2] Ibid. can. 10. 31. [3] Conc. Carth. iv. can. 16. Cod. Theodos. lib. 16. tit. v. leg. 66. [4] Chrysost. Hom. 76. de Anathemate. tom. 1. p. 909.

CHAPTER THIRD.

OF THE PERSONS SUBJECTED TO ECCLESIASTICAL DISCIPLINE, AND OF THE CRIMES WHICH INCURRED IT.

§ 217. *All members of the Church liable to discipline.*

All persons who fell into great or scandalous sins or crimes after baptism were subjects of ecclesiastical discipline, whether men or women, priests or people, rich or poor, princes or subjects: for the Church made no distinction, except when the numbers of sinners combined rendered Church censures impossible, or when there was reason to fear more harm than good would attend the attempt to execute them. Catechumens, as occupying a middle state between the world and the Church, and not yet admitted to full communion, were not proper objects of Church discipline, except as they might be degraded from a higher to a lower station of catechumenship, and of being kept a very long period in the state of catechumens. The discipline of which we now speak respected only the full communicants; and among them no distinction of persons was made. Many instances might be cited of the impartial boldness of the Church in inflicting censures upon princes and kings. Thus Chrysostom extols at large the conduct of Babylas in denying entrance to the Church to one of the Roman Emperors who had committed murder upon a hostage.[1] In like manner Ambrose repelled the emperor Thodosius the Great from church for many months, until he had humbled himself and made all possible reparation, for an indiscriminating slaughter at Thessalonica.. Theodoret relates the story at large,[2] and after describing how the bishop Ambrose expelled the Emperor from the church, he says, "the king was so moved that he returned to his palace with groans and tears. Eight months passed between this and the festival of our Saviour's nativity, and all that time the Emperor sat lamenting in his own palace, and shedding rivers of tears. Which Ruffin, the master of the palace, who for his familiarity with the Emperor could take a great freedom with him, observing, came to him, and desired to know the reason of his

---

[1] Chrysost. de Babyla. tom. i. p. 740. [2] Theodoret. lib. v. cap. 18.

tears. To whom the Emperor replied, you make a jest of the thing, Ruffin: for you are not touched with the sense of my misfortunes; but I mourn and lament in consideration of my calamity, that whilst the temple of God is open to the very slaves and beggars, and they can go in freely, and supplicate their Lord, it is inaccessible to me; and besides all this, heaven is shut against me: for I remember the words of our Lord, which plainly say, Whomsoever ye shall bind on earth, he shall be bound in heaven. Then Ruffin said, I will go therefore to the bishop, if you please, and intreat him to loose your bonds. The Emperor replied, he will not be persuaded. For I know the justice of the sentence which St. Ambrose has given, and he will not out of any reverence to the imperial power, transgress the divine law. But Ruffin insisted, and with many words promising to appease Ambrose towards him; he bid him go quickly, and he himself followed a little after, relying upon the promises of Ruffin. But St. Ambrose no sooner saw Ruffin, but he said to him, Ruffin, thou art a very shameless man. For thou wast the evil counsellor of so great a slaughter, and now thou hardenest thy forehead, and hast cast away shame, neither blushing, nor trembling for so great a ravagement made of the image of God. Ruffin still went on with his supplication, and told him the Emperor himself was coming. At which Ambrose, kindled with a divine fervour, said, I tell thee before-hand, Ruffin, I will not admit him within the divine gates: but and if he will turn his empire into tyranny, and slay me also, I shall with great pleasure take my death. Ruffin hearing this, sent one immediately to the Emperor, to certify him of the bishop's resolution, and to desire him to stay in the palace: but the Emperor being on his way in the middle of the forum, when he received the message, said, I will go and bear his just reproofs. When he came to the holy boundaries he would not enter into the church, but going to the bishop, as he sat in the saluting house, he begged of him to absolve him from his bonds. But Ambrose told him, that his coming was tyrannical; and that he now began to rage against God, and trample upon the divine laws. The Emperor said, by no means: I do not offer myself against the prescript of the laws, I do not desire to enter the church in an unlawful manner; but I entreat you to absolve me from my bonds, and to remember the clemency of our common Lord, and not shut the gate against me, which the Lord hath opened to all those, that turn to him with repentance. What

repentance, then said the bishop, have you shewn since the commission of so great a wickedness; with what medicine have you cured your grievous wounds? The Emperor replied, it belongs to your office to prepare the medicine, and cure those wounds, and my part is to use what you prescribe. Then said Ambrose, forasmuch as you have suffered anger and fury, and not reason, to sit in judgment and give sentence in matters before: now make a law, which may render all judgment given in anger null and void: when any sentence of death or confiscation is pronounced, let there be thirty days time between that and the execution, to wait for the judgment of reason. When this term is expired, let the scribes again present the sentence you have given before you, and then reason without anger will be able to examine the sentence by her own judgment, and discern whether it be just or unjust. If it be unjust, cancel and reverse it: if just, corroborate and confirm it, and this number of days will be no prejudice to any righteous sentence. The Emperor approved of the proposal, and immediately ordered such a law to be written, and confirmed it with his own hand. Then St. Ambrose absolved him from his bonds, and the Emperor took courage to enter into the church: but he would neither stand nor kneel, while he made supplication to the Lord, but fell upon his face to the earth, using those words of David, 'My soul cleaveth to the ground, quicken thou me according to thy word;' and tearing his hair, and beating his forehead, and watering the pavement with drops of tears, with these indications of sorrow he prayed for pardon. And so when the time of oblation came, he was admitted again to make his offering at the holy table."

Excommunication was never or very rarely inflicted upon minors or children under age; fatherly rebukes and other corrections being deemed more appropriate.

§ 218. *None to be excommunicated without being heard and convicted.*

The Church insisted greatly upon care being used never to involve the innocent with the guilty, in the infliction of ecclesiastical censures. The Romish custom of interdicts, whereby whole nations were put under the ban of excommunication, was entirely unknown to the ancient Church. Augustine expresses the liveliest indignation because a rash young African bishop had excommunicated a

whole family for the single offence of its head, and expostulates with him for it.[1] The Church held that an unjust sentence condemned not, except him that passed it. Augustine says: "that a man had need be very careful whom he binds on earth; for unjust bonds will be loosed by the justice of heaven; and not only so, but turn to the condemnation of him that imposes them," &c.[2]

To prevent injustice the Church prescribed several rules of caution in regard to excommunication. Besides requiring ordinarily the previous *admonition* of which mention has been made, it was ordered that no one should be condemned in his absence, nor without liberty to appear and answer for himself. So says the council of Carthage.[3]

Another rule was that none should be excommunicated without being fully convicted of the crime in question. This might be either by his own confession, or by credible testimony, or by such plain notoriety, as made a man *ipso facto*, liable to excommunication.

§ 219. *Excommunication after death.*

It has been remarked that when persons died impenitent under sentence of excommunication, they were denied Christian burial, and, their names having been erased from the *Dyptichs*, or roll of those who died in peace and communion with the Church, they had no part in the memorials or commemorative prayers and thanksgivings made for those who died in faith. It appears also that when a person dying in visible communion with the Church, was discovered after his death to have done that which made him liable to excommunication, there was a species of excommunication then inflicted, by erasing his name from the *dyptichs*, refusing oblations in his name, and forbidding all commemorative prayers for him. A decree to this effect we find in the African code, against any bishop that should make heretics or heathen his heirs.[4]

§ 220. *The censure of the Church not inflicted for light offences.*

The canons distinguish nicely between the greater and lesser sins, and forbid excommunication to be inflicted except for the former.

---

[1] August. Ep. 75 ad Auxillum. [2] Aug. Ser. 16. de verbis Dom. [3] Conc. Carth. iv. can. 30. [4] Cod Afric. 82.

The ancients believed in no such distinction as the Romish, between venial and mortal sins, requiring the latter to be made the subject of auricular confession and private absolution. They counted no sins as venial in the sense of not needing pardon and absolution of God. But sins of human infirmity and inadvertency, to which the best of men were liable, who with an honest and good will served God, these they called venial, as distinguished from wilful, deliberate and habitual sins of a more malignant nature. The former needed no other than the daily repentance and confession of Christians, whereby invoking divine mercy, they received a daily pardon. And as to the latter sins, many of them were not ordinarily visited with highest censures of the Church, but only rebukes, admonitions, and suspension. But there was still a third sort which, being not only wilful, but flagrant in their kind, and sometimes public or open in their commission, were the sins which in the ancient Church were termed the *greater* or mortal sins, and upon which the highest severities of Church discipline were exercised. Augustine strictly makes this three-fold distinction, saying, "there are some sins so great as to deserve to be punished with excommunication." Again, "there are other sins which are to be cured by the medicine of reproof. Lastly, there are sins, for which Christ hath left us a daily cure in that prayer, wherein he hath taught us to say, 'Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us.'" [1]

The ancient distinction then between mortal and venial sins referred solely to those that did, and those that did not, subject men to excommunication. Hence the term *major poenitentia*, or the greater repentance, the public penance for mortal or greater sins, such as adultery, sacrilege and the like.

It was not allowed in the ancient Church that excommunication should be inflicted for pecuniary or civil matters. Nor were bishops allowed to use it out of any private motive—as the avenging of any insult or wrong done to them personally. The council of Sardis forbids bishops to excommunicate any persons in a passion—and allows the injured to appeal to a provincial Synod.[2]

---

[1] August. de Fid. et Operib. cap. 26. Tract. xii. in Joh. p. 47. [2] Conc. Sardic. can. 14. Cypr. Ep. 10. al. 16. ad Clerum. Greg. Mag. lib. ii. ep. 34.

The Church inflicted her severe censures for overt acts, and not for sins of intention or thought;[1] nor for forced and involuntary actions.[2]

§ 221. *A more particular account of the greater sins, such as incurred the discipline of the Church.*

There has been a difference of opinion as to the number of greater sins. In Augustine's time, some were for confining the great crimes, for which excommunication was inflicted, to three, idolatry, adultery, and murder. Augustine declares himself against this opinion. The civil law, in its list of ***Atrocia Delicta***, or crimes whose punishment was not remitted at those seasons when the emperors pardoned convicts, extended it much further, including sometimes six, eight and ten such crimes. And Augustine expressly says that the great crimes, for which the ecclesiastical law inflicted excommunication and public penance, were against the whole decalogue;[3] but this must be taken of overt and capital acts, distinguishing them from remoter branches or lower degrees of violation of the respective commandments. With this distinction, it is true that every commandment of the decalogue might be so violated as to bring men under the discipline of the Church.

In a brief enumeration of the principal of those sins which subjected to Church censure, the order of the decalogue will therefore be followed.

§ 222. *Greater crimes against the first and second Commandments: Idolatry.*

These two commandments were commonly joined together, and the greater crimes against them were comprised under the general names of apostacy and irreligion, comprehending idolatry, blaspheming and denying Christ in time of persecution; using the wicked arts of magic, divination, &c.; dishonouring God by sacrilege and simony, heresy and schism.

Idolatry, as a crime committed by Christians, was usually practised through fear in times of persecution, when the heathen impri-

---

[1] Conc. Neocæs. can. 4. [2] Conc. Ancyr. can. 3. [3] Aug. Hom. ult. ex. 50. tom. iii. p. 205.

soned, tortured, or put to death all who would not deny Christ by blaspheming him, or by joining in heathen worship. Hence it involved also the guilt of apostasy, and denial of known truth. Those who apostatized in times of persecution through fear, were called *lapsers*. There were several sorts of these idolaters, and the severity of the Church in dealing with them was proportioned to the various ways in which the crime was committed, and to its heinousness. There were the *Sacraficati* and *Thurificati*, those who renounced Christ by burning incense and partaking of sacrifices to idol gods at heathen altars. And according as circumstances extenuated or enhanced their guilt, they were compelled to do penance, in the different classes of penitents, from four to ten years before they could be restored to the communion of the Church. If they fell again after restoration, the penance was still more prolonged and severe.[1] These canons applied to such as apostatized after suffering, imprisonment, torture, and threats of death. But if any voluntarily apostatized, without violence, torture or the like strong temptation, the council of Nice orders them twelve years of penance;[2] and other councils the same;[3] while the council of Valens puts them under penance all their lives, and allows them absolution only at the hour of death,[4] and the council of Eliberis goes further still, and refuses to admit them even in their last moments to the communion of the Church.[5]

These canons refer to cases where the offenders, more or less speedily after crime, and their excommunication, petitioned the Church to be admitted to do penance. But in regard to such as voluntarily apostatized, and never afterwards made humble request to be admitted to penance, till in the hour of sickness and prospect of death, the council of Arles decrees that they should not be received, unless they recovered to bring forth fruits meet for repentance.[6]

There were other sorts of lapsing into idolatry—such as making a written abjuration of Christ to the heathen magistrate—sending a friend or servant to do it privately before the magistrate in one's stead—bribing the judge to secure one's safety—feigning madness

[1] Conc. Ancyr. can. 4, 8, 9. [2] Conc. Nic. can. 11. [3] Conc. Arelat. ii. can. 10. [4] Conc. Valentin. can. 3. [5] Conc. Eliber. can. 1. [6] Conc. Arelat. i. can. 23.

or fits, when brought to the heathen altars and required to sacrifice to idols. All these were excommunicated, and put upon a period of penance more or less prolonged.

So likewise the Church subjected to penance all such Christians, as connected themselves with, and promoted, or indirectly sanctioned idolatry, though they did not sacrifice to idols, or openly abjure Christ. Any Christian accepting the office of *Flamen*, or heathen priest, whose office it was to exhibit games and spectacles, was excommunicated by the council of Eliberis till the hour of death.[1] In the same way all who took upon them any public civil offices, which made part and parcel of idolatrous systems, or proceeded upon the recognition of idol worship, were put under censure. For the same reason, all actors and stage players, charioteers, and other performers at the public games, with which were connected idolatrous rites. Likewise all makers of idol images, temples and ornaments; all traffickers in things directly bought for idol worship, as frankincense and victims. These were called *procuratores idololatriæ, purveyors for idolatry.*

The council of Eliberis forbids Christians even to go to idol temples merely to see their worship, out of an idle curiosity and without necessary reason, under penalty of ten years' penance.[2] The council of Ancyra[3] forbids under pain of two years' penance any one eating his own meat in an idol temple; and so likewise Christians were excommunicated if they joined in feasting with the heathen on any idol festivals, or with the Jews in their synagogues.[4]

The idolatry of worshipping angels, saints, martyrs, and images, was also forbidden, and such as did it excommunicated as heretics.

And finally all who in any way encouraged or connived at idolatry were censured. Thus masters were not to allow their servants to keep idols in their houses, else they were suspended from communion. Landlords, accepting in their accounts with tenants items as given to idols, were put under penance five years: and those who loaned dresses or ornaments to the heathen to set off the pomp of idolatrous ceremonies, were to be suspended three years.[5]

---

[1] Conc. Eliber. can. 3. [2] Conc. Eliber. can. 59. [3] Conc. Ancyr. can. 7.
[4] Conc. Laod. can. 39. Canon. Apost. 71. [5] Conc. Eliber. can. 12. 40. 57.

§ 223. *Crimes against the first and second commandments continued; the practice of forbidden arts, as Divination, Magic, and Enchantment.*

Another class of great crimes which incurred excommunication was the practice of curious arts, of which there were numberless sorts. They may be spoken of under three general heads, Divination, Magic, and Enchantment.

Divination comprehends all the ways and arts of discovering secrets, or foretelling events, not knowable by the laws of nature. It includes particularly astrology; likewise augury and soothsaying, in all its various ways, whether by observation of entrails, flights of birds, lines of the hands, face, &c.; divination by compact with satan, performed in various ways, but comprehended under the general name of μαντεία, *prophesying by satan's inspiration.* All these subjected men to excommunication, and to penance proportioned to the particular offence.[1]

Magic comprehends all arts of mischievous operation by secret means, called sorcery, *maleficia* and *veneficia*, because by drugs, poisons, or other secret things, they practiced against the lives, health or purity of other persons. Such as used these arts were condemned to death by the civil code, and put in the list of those guilty of the *atrocia delicta*, for which there was no pardon. As to the Church her censures were of the severest kind.[2]

The Church also condemned all those *enchantments* which were superstitiously used for good ends—as amulets, charms, spells, &c. to cure or avert disease or danger;[3] also all workers of false miracles, and other such impostors and jugglers as practiced upon the superstitious imaginations or fears of men.

§ 224. *Further crimes against the first and second commandments, which subjected offenders to discipline: apostasy, heresy and schism.*

Besides the *lapsers*, those who fell away from Christianity through fear of persecution, there were those who fell away from principle,

[1] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 32. Tolet. 1. can. contr. Priscill. Tertull. de Idololat. cap. ix. Conc. Eliber. can. 62. Conc. Agathen. 42. Conc. Ancyr. can. 25. [2] Conc. Laodi. can. 36. Ancyr. can. 25. Basil. can. 7. 65. Carth. iv. can. 89. [3] Conc. Laod. 36. Chrysost. in Ps. ix. 15.

or choice, or dislike of religion, and either totally or partially went back to Judaism or paganism. All such were excommunicated, and by some canons never restored to communion, by others only at the hour of death.[1]

Heresy and schism were also reckoned among the crimes against the first commandment; the one violating the unity of the faith, the other the unity of the worship and discipline of the Church. In her censures of these crimes, the Church, unable to know the hearts of men in every case, was obliged to proceed upon general rules, varying however the rigour of punishment according to such allowance as seemed just in individual cases.

After admonition in vain given, heretics were anathematized and cast out of the Church; and as long as they continued in their heresy, they were by some rules forbidden to enter the church at all; but this was not the general rule; for they were in most churches permitted to be present during the reading of the Scriptures and the preaching of the sermon, in order that they might thereby be converted.[2]

It has already been mentioned that excommunicated heretics and schismatics, were to be debarred the privileges of social familiarity with Catholic Christians, from alliance with them, &c. Christians were also fobidden to go to their assemblies, under pain of excommunication. Nor were heretics allowed to give evidence in any ecclesiastical cause against a Catholic. All Catholics were forbidden to make heretics their heirs. No heretic, even upon his return to the Church, was ever allowed to be ordained or promoted to any ecclesiastical dignity. Catholic Christians were forbidden, under pain of excommunication, to bring any cause whatever before an heretical judge.

Whenever heretics showed a disposition to return to the unity of the Church, they were admitted to penance, which varied according to the circumstances of the case. The council of Eliberis appoints ten years' penance before they could be admitted to communion.[3] Clergy falling into heresy were by some churches treated with particular strictness; being by some rules enjoined twelve years' pen-

[1] Conc. Eliber. can. 1. 46. Cypr. Ep. 53. al. 55. ad Antonian. p. 110.
[2] Conc. Laod. can. 6. [3] Conc. Eliber. can. 22.

ance; and by others allowed communion only at the point of death.[1] The same general rules applied to schismatics as to heretics.

§ 225. *Other crimes reckoned against the first commandment: sacrilege and simony.*

Sacrilege, in the converting things appropriated to sacred uses to other purposes, subjected to excommunication; as the taking for common uses the sacred vessels of the Church, vestments; oblations made at death withheld from the Church by survivors, &c.[2]

It was also reckoned as sacrilege to rob the graves of the dead, deface the monuments, &c. These were regarded as sacred and inviolable places, and the violation of them, was put among the *atrocia delicta* by the civil codes.

There was another sort of persons who delivered up the Scriptures, or sacred vessels of the Church, to heathen in time of persecution. They were called *traditores*, *traitors*, or *betrayers*, and were excommunicated or guilty of sacrilege.[3]

There was also the sacrilege of blaspheming or mocking the sacraments, breaking or profaning the altars, churches; which atrocious sins were seldom committed by any bearing the Christian name.

Simony in the ancient Church was distinguished into three sorts, 1. The buying and selling of spiritual gifts. 2. Buying and selling spiritual offices and preferments. 3. Usurpation or intrusion into sacred offices or functions. All these were strictly forbidden by the laws of the ancient Church, and punished by excommunication, and in the case of the clergy by degradation and excommunication.[4]

§ 226. *Sins against the third commandment. Blasphemy, Profane swearing, perjury, and breach of vows.*

Of the sins against the third commandment which brought men under public ecclesiastical discipline, the first that may be mentioned is *Blasphemy*. Of this the ancients distinguished three sorts. 1. The

---

[1] Conc. Rom. can. 2. 3. [2] Canon. Apost. 72, 73. Conc. Carth. iv. can. 95. [3] Conc. Arelat. i. can. 13. [4] Canon. Apost. 29. Conc. Chalced. c. 2. Conc. Nice. ii. can. 5. Eliber. can. 48. Conc. Nic. can. 15. Antioch. can. 21. Sardic. can. 1. 2.

blasphemy of apostates and lapsers whom the heathen persecutors obliged not only to deny, but to curse Christ. 2. The blasphemy of heretics and other profane Christians. 3. The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.

Of the first sort Pliny gives account where he tells of Christians who in the time of persecution not only renounced their religion, and in token of it sacrificed to the heathen gods, but also cursed and reviled Christ. Such the Church excommunicated and treated with great rigour as those who had contracted the three-fold guilt of lapsing, idolatry, and blasphemy.[1]

The second sort of blasphemy was profane and impious discourses derogatory to the honour and majesty of God. Heretics were in this sense frequently charged with the guilt of blasphemy, and punished accordingly.

Of the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost much has been said and written, and not a little perplexity has been felt in regard to the sense of the ancients. Some say it was committed by those who lapsed into apostacy by idolatry and denying of Christ. So Cyprian understands it; with whom agrees Hilary who also charges it upon the Arians and such heretics as denied the Divinity of Christ, and so likewise Athanasius.[2]

Some make it the denying the Divinity of the Holy Ghost.[3]

Others place this sin in maliciously ascribing the works of the Holy Spirit to the power of the devil; and some of them consider the essence of it to consist in malignantly doing this against knowledge and conviction.[4] Those who took this view of the sin against the Holy Ghost, did several of them consider it as absolutely unpardonable both in this world and the next. But the general sense and practice of the ancient Church did not regard those sins which were considered and punished as blasphemy of the Holy Ghost, to be unpardonable, except where it was wilfully persisted in to final impenitence. Augustine often speaks of this sin as consisting in a wilful and continual resisting of the gracious motions and influences of the Holy Spirit; but in this sense it could of course never be a subject

---

[1] Plin. lib. x. ep. 97. [2] Cypr. Ep. 10. al. 16. p. 36. Hilar. in Mat. can. 31. Athan. in illud Quicunque dixerit verbum. [3] Epiphan. Hares. 74. Ambrose, de Spir. Sanct. lib. 1. cap. 3. [4] Aug. Quæst. in Vet. et Nov. Test. 9. 102. tom. iv. p. 452. Aug. Expos. in Rom. tom. iv. p. 365.

of ecclesiastical discipline, which took cognizance only of overt actions. In cases, where men openly denied the divinity, or blasphemed the name of the Holy Ghost, directly or indirectly, the Church, as in other great sins, proceeded to excommunication, and if the offenders were humbled and sued for penance they were put upon it, according to the nature of the offence; but if they persisted in impenitence, and died excommunicate, they were judged to have consummated the unpardonable sin; and like other excommunicated persons, were deprived of Christian burial, and of the suffrages of the Church and their names being stricken out of the *dyptichs*, no memorial of them was ever afterwards made.

§ 227. *Of Profane Swearing. All oaths not forbidden.*

The next sin against the third commandment which the Church visited with ecclesiastical censure, was profane swearing. By this they meant not all solemn oaths for the confirmation of truth and the ends of justice and religion. The lawfulness of such oaths in the opinion of the Church is abundantly manifest, among other things, from the custom of requiring the oath against simony, &c., from bishops at their consecration. The oath of allegiance is ordered by the fifth council of Toledo, and the other councils of Toledo have a number of canons recognizing and prescribing oaths in several cases.[1] What was allowed however was only solemn swearing by the name of God or upon the gospels; and all oaths which recognized false gods, as in the heathen modes of swearing, were forbidden.

The habit of vain and common swearing—vulgar and profane use of oaths, imprecations, curses, &c., with irreverent use of the names and titles of God and Christ—every thing that we now understand by habitual profanity, subjected to Church discipline.

So also swearing by creatures—by saints, angels, by the emperor's genius or demon, &c., which were all considered as dishonouring the name of God.

§ 228. *Of Perjury and Breach of vows.*

Perjury was punished as a crime against the name and majesty of God. This crime included false swearing—swearing to an un-

[1] Conc. Tolet. v. can. 2. iv. can. 74. 39. viii. can. 2. [2] Conc. Ilerdens. can. 7.

lawful thing—and swearing to do a lawful thing and breaking the oath. Swearing to do an unlawful thing—as for instance to live in perpetual enmity with a man—was punished by excommunication and a year's penance by the council of Serida.[1] The Church decided that all unlawful oaths are null, and must be broken; and the sin of taking them repented of. According however as the guilt was extenuated by being committed rashly in temporary excitement of passion and instantly repented of, the penance was shortened.[2]

The perjury of false swearing, and of not performing a lawful oath, were most severely punished. Basil imposes ten years' penance—ordering the perjurer to be a mourner two years, an hearer three, a prostrator four, a co-stander one.[3] The council of Mascon decrees that such as were suborners of perjury, or led others to false swearing, should do penance to the hour of death—should be branded as infamous and never allowed to give testimony.[4]

The *breach of vows* differed from not performing a lawful oath, only in this, that the solemn promise was made directly to God. It related both to persons and things. If a man vowed to give his estate or any part of it to the service of God, it was a sacriligious breach of vow, to retract it; and punished by Church discipline. There was also a breach of vow which concerned the dedication of persons to God, as the clergy, monks, virgins, widows. These, violating their vows by returning to a secular life, were subjects of severe Church censure.[5]

§ 229. *Violations of the fourth Commandment: Profaning the Lord's day.*

The object here is only to notice such violations of the Lord's day as subjected men to the discipline of the Church.

The Church then required attendance upon public worship of the Lord's day. To be absent altogether, as the schismatics and heretics, by a voluntary separation from the communion of the Church, incurred the highest censure.

To be frequently and for a length of time negligent of attendance, especially after admonitions, incurred excommunication. So like-

[1] Conc. Ilerdens. can. 7 [2] Conc. Tolet. viii. can. 2. [3] Basil. can. 64.
[4] Conc. Matiscon. i. can. 17. [5] Conc. Chalced. can. 7. Turon. can. 5. 16. Basil. can. 40.

wise attendance upon a part of the service and neglecting the rest, as has been noticed in treating of the communion service. Fasting on Sunday was also prohibited, under pain of excommunication.

For the due observance of Sunday, the Church made many other specific rules, the violation of which, as not being punished with excommunication, will better be noticed when we speak of the festivals of the Church. One thing may here be mentioned as incurring the highest censure of the Church—the frequenting of the public theatres, games, spectacles, &c., on Sunday. This, after admonition was punished with excommunication.[1]

§ 230. *Great crimes against the fifth Commandment: Disobedience to Parents, Treason, Contempt of the Laws of the Church.*

From the principles of her discipline, and from the nature of the case, the Church could not notice in her discipline, all the various forms of the sin of disobedience or contempt of parents; but only the more gross and overt acts. She punished with excommunication all children, who under pretence of devoting themselves to a religious life, deserted their parents, against their consent. All children who married against the consent of their parents, were severely punished by ecclesiastical, as well as by the civil laws. Augustine says that parents "have this right over their children, to dispose of them in marriage, unless they be of that age which gives them liberty to choose for themselves."[2] Tertullian says, "children cannot lawfully marry without the consent of their earthly parents."[3] Abduction of virgins, or carrying them off against the will of their parents, exposed the abductors to be treated as fornicators, that is, to four years' penance.[4]

Slaves were also in the same way forbidden to marry without the consent of their masters, and in case they did, were punished as above.

All treason, disloyalty, disrespect to princes or civil governments, were severely punished, when exhibited in such manner as to come properly within the censures of the Church. The fourth council of

---

[1] Conc. Carth. iv. can. 88. can. 24. [2] August. Ep. 233. ad Benenatum. [3] Tertull. ad. Uxor. lib. ii. cap. 9. [4] Basil. can. 22.

Carthage forbids the ordination of any seditious person. The fourth council of Toledo orders all clergymen who took up arms in any sedition to be degraded, and to do penance all their lives. And in general, all participation by word or deed in seditions, conspiracies, and rebellions; and all disloyal and scandalous contempts of kings and civil authority, were severely censured, as violations of the reverence and honour due to *civil* parents.

So likewise all contempt of the authority and laws of the Church, was punished as violating the honour due to *spiritual* parents. Thus the first council of Carthage orders, "If any one viciously transgress or contemn the decrees of the Church; if he be a layman let him be excommunicated; if a clergyman, let him be deprived of the honour of his order."[1] Similar canons were passed by the councils of Epone and the third of Toledo.[2] The council of Antioch excommunicates all who pertinaciously oppose the rule made by the council of Nice about the celebration of Easter.[3] The fourth council of Toledo orders the excommunication of such as reject the use of the hymns and prayers appointed by the Church.[4]

§ 231. *Great crimes against the sixth commandment: Murder, Manslaughter, &c.*

Murder by the civil laws was among the *atrocia delicta*, and *atrocissama crimina*, heinous and capital crimes, which were excepted from the benefit of appeal or pardon. The Church always excepted such from the privilege of sanctuary. And in regard to such as might escape capital punishment by the civil law, the Church subjected them to her severest censures; some churches keeping them in penance all their lives, and not admitting them to communion at the hour of death,[5]—others admitted them to communion at their last hours.[6] At a later period, Basil reduced the penance to twenty years—four as a mourner, five as a hearer, seven as a prostrator, four as a co-stander.[7]

The discipline was still more severe where the murder was com-

---

[1] Conc. Carth. can. 14. [2] Conc. Eponens. can. 40. Tolet. iii. edict. Reccard. [3] Conc. Antioch. can. 1. [4] Conc. Tolet. iv. can. 1. [5] Tertull. de Pudicit. cap. 12. Cypr. Ep. 52 al. 55. ad Anton. p. 110. [6] Conc. Ancyr. can. 22. [7] Basil. can. 56.

plicated with other great crimes as adultery, magical or diabolical arts, &c. Some canons forbid those guilty in this way, ever to be received to the peace of the Church. Child murder and the procuring of abortion, where peculiar circumstances and strength of temptation extenuated the guilt, subjected to ten years' penance.[1]

Self-murder, was a crime which could have no penance imposed upon it; but the Church deprived such as destroyed themselves of the rites of Christian burial, and of memorial in her prayers.[2] In the same way also she treated those who suffered death for their crimes. All those who disfigured or dismembered themselves, were forever forbidden ordination as clergymen, and were put under three years' penance, before they could be restored to communion.[3]

Manslaughter, and accidental murder, as where death was the result of violence, or of evil passions, though not intended, were punished by the Church, even where the civil law took little or no notice of such cases. Thus, in the council of Eliberis it was decreed, that if a mistress in the heat of anger scourge her slave, so that the slave die within three days; if it appeared that it was a voluntary murder, she was to do penance seven years, if casual, five.[4] Among the Apostolical Canons, is one which orders that if a clergyman in a brawl smite another so as to kill him, he shall be deposed; if a layman, he shall be excommunicated.[5] Basil's canons impose eleven years' penance upon all involuntary murders.[6]

False swearing to take away life—informing against, or betraying the brethren to death in times of persecution—were both reputed murder, and the person who was guilty of the latter, in case any one was killed in consequence of his treachery, was never to be admitted to communion, or, as some copies, not till his last hour.[7] Exposing infants was also reputed murder.

All accessories to murder were to do the same penance as the principals. And in this connection it may be mentioned, that the Church condemned all arts, callings, and games which led to murder; as gladiatorial teachers and fighters. Spectators of such murders as were committed in the amphitheatres, were also severely

---

[1] Conc. Ancyr. can. 21. Basil. can. 2. 8. [2] Conc. Bracar. 1. can 34. [3] Can. Apost. c. 21. 22. Conc. Nic. can. 1. [4] Conc. Elibcr. can. 5. [5] Conc. Apost. 66. [6] Basil, can. 57. [7] Conc. Eliber. can. 74.

punished. The Church also excommunicated as murderers, all such as suffered their relatives, or the poor, to perish for want of food; also all those by whose authority murder was committed, and especially such Christian magistrates, as took the office of *munerarii*, and furnished or ordered those public shows of gladiators in which men murdered each other in fighting for public amusement.

As lower degrees of murder, and tending to it, the Church subjected to discipline all such as were guilty of open hatreds, quarrellings, and strife, and professed malice.

§ 332. *Great crimes against the seventh commandment; Adultery, &c.*

The severities of ecclesiastical discipline were always imposed upon violations of this commandment; such as fornication, adultery, rape, incest, polygamy, all sorts of unnatural pollution; and all things tending to produce such impurities, as rioting and intemperance, writing, vending, or reading lewd books, acting or frequenting obscene plays, and every thing of the like nature.

By some canons such as were guilty of fornication were forbidden ever to be received to holy orders, or suspended if unwittingly ordained.[1] Basil's canons order seven years' penance for this crime.[2]

But for adultery the term of penance prescribed in Basil is fourteen years. The council of Ancyra makes it but seven; of Eliberis five for a single act, ten if repeated.[3] In some churches those guilty of it were never restored to communion till at the hour of death.[4]

All marriages of relations within certain degrees were censured, and penance imposed from ten to twenty years according to the case. These degrees included some not reckoned prohibited at the present day; as the marrying two sisters or brothers in succession, which was punished by fifteen years' excommunication, and sometimes by excommunication to the day of death.[5] In the early ages however there was no prohibition of the marriage of cousin-germans.

As to polygamy, the having two or more wives at once, Basil observes that the Fathers of the Church said little or nothing about it

---

[1] Canon. Apost. 53. al. 61. Conc. Neocæs. can. 9. [2] Basil. can. 58. [3] Conc. Ancyr. can. 20. Eliber. can. 69 and 64. [4] Cypr. Ep. 55, al. 53. ad Antonian. p. 109. [5] Basil. can. 78. Conc. Neocæsar. can. 2.

—deeming it as a barbarous and brutish vice to which mankind had no great propensity. But he determines it to be a great sin and deserving a long penance. The council of Toledo accounts the same thing as polygamy for a man to have a wife and a concubine, and orders such to be excommunicated. But a man, having no wife, but a concubine instead, was not repelled from the communion, provided they were faithfully joined to each other; for in such a case the Church counted her as his wife, although the civil law might deny her certain rights, privileges, and honours which belonged to a legal wife.

The marrying after unlawful divorce was accounted and disciplined as polygamy. The ecclesiastical laws were very strict against divorce—allowing it only in case of adultery or malicious desertion.

There were some individuals who thought it unlawful for Christians to marry again even after lawful divorce, especially while the other party was alive. So Augustine; and so the council of Arles declares it unlawful, for men who put away their wives for adultery to marry again; but they do not order the greater excommunication, but only advice and admonition.[1] But other councils forbid the marriage of divorced persons, while either party is alive, under pain of excommunication, and order that the parties shall be reconciled or live single.[2] But this point was one of some difficulty and difference of opinion.

On the other point however there was a universal agreement, that to marry after unlawful divorce, and while the other party was living, was to be punished with the severest censures of the Church. By some councils such as did so were to be refused communion even at their last hour;[3] and all canons agree in debarring men who did so from holy orders.

There were some particular churches that treated second, third and fourth marriages with severity; but it was no general rule of the Catholic Church to bring such under discipline.

All beastly and unnatural impurities were punished with peculiar severity; such as were guilty of them being excluded from entering the Church, and exposing them *inter hyemantes*, among the raving

---

[1] August. de Fid. et Oper. cap. 19. Conc. Arelat. i. can. 10. [2] Conc. Milvet. can. 17. Cod. Afric. can. 105. [3] Conc. Eliber. can. 8.

demoniacs or exposed to the weather without the walls of the church. Basil imposes twenty years' penance, and sometimes lengthens the term to thirty years.[1] The council of Eliberis, as the punishment for sodomy, orders that the communion be denied even at the last hour.[2]

Besides acts of impurity the Church was strict in regard to all things that tended to it—as the writing or reading of lewd books, frequenting theatres and spectacles against modesty, promiscuous and wanton dancing, songs, riotous and intemperate feasting, &c. &c. All these things were punished with excommunication and penance, and in case of clergymen with degradation.

§ 233. *Great crimes against the eighth commandment; Theft, Fraud, Oppression, &c.*

The denial of the right of private property was a point of error among some heretics, who were condemned by the Church on this account.

Simple theft was sometimes, according to the circumstances of the case, put among the lesser, sometimes among the greater sins. When any case fell into the latter class, Basil's canons order, "that if the thief discover himself, he shall do one year's penance; if detected by others, two, half the time as a prostrator, the other half as a co-stander."[3] Augustine intimates that there was difficulty, except in very plain cases, in applying the discipline of the Church to this sort of offences against justice; as also the detaining of lost goods, refusing to pay just debts, oppressive and usurous exactions, frauds, breach of trust, &c. All these things, in certain cases where they came clearly within the reach of the discipline of the Church, were severely censured. Idleness and gaming subjected to excommunication. As to robbery by violence, incendiarism, arson, and malicious destruction of the property of others, as they were punished with great severity by the civil laws, so the Church as a matter of course inflicted her severest censures.

---

[1] Basil. can. 62. and 63. [2] Conc. Eliber. can. 71. [3] Basil. can. 61.

§ 234. *Great crimes against the ninth commandment: False accusation, Slander, &c.*

There are innumerable violations of this, as also of the other commandments, which though very heinous in their nature, were yet not *great* in the technical sense, that is not such as the Church could punish by the severities of discipline and penance. But in such cases as the discipline of the Church could reach and apply to, it was strict.

Here is included all legal false swearing to the hurt of men's goods, or life, or reputation, which was regarded as guilt beyond that of simple perjury. The penance in such cases was often prolonged to the end of life.[1]

So also all libelling, slander and detraction, according to the clearness of the proof, the aggravation of the guilt, and the injury sustained, were, whenever the Church could reach them, subjected to the severities of discipline. So much for defamatory and malicious lying to the injury of men's good name.

As to simple lying, when there were such cases, as came under the discipline of the Church, it was dealt with, but not so severely as the former.

§ 235. *Crimes against the tenth commandment: Envy, Covetousness, &c.*

Little is found in the ancient discipline respecting sins against this commandment, because though great crimes, they were chiefly internal, and the Church could not notice them till they showed themselves in external acts. Thus envy was a crime of diabolical malignity, but before it could bring a man under discipline, it must manifest itself in word or act. So with covetousness: and when these sins of the heart displayed themselves in action, they commonly proceeded to such violations of justice, as were more properly referred to the other commandments, and disciplined according to the rules laid down for particular crimes, as murder, fraud, theft, and the like.

---

[1] Conc. Eliber. can. 64. Conc. Agathen. can. 37. Conc. Venetic. can. 1.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

OF THE EXERCISE OF DISCIPLINE IN REGARD TO THE CLERGY OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

§ 236. *Of the peculiar notion of Communio Ecclesiastica, and Excommunicatio Ecclesiastica, as applied to Clergymen.*

The discipline of the Church as it respected all her members falling into sins worthy of excommunication, has hitherto been noticed. It is necessary to glance at some distinctions in this respect between the clergy and laity, inasmuch as there were some Church censures peculiar to the offices of clergymen, and which could not be applied to laymen.

Clerical and lay communion were considered different things, and a man might be deprived of the former, and continue to enjoy the latter; and what was often a great punishment to a clerical person, would be none to a layman. Hence the words *communio*, and *excommunicatio ecclesiastica*, *ecclesiastical communion* and *excommunication*, were often taken in a peculiar sense as signifying the suspension or degradation of clergymen from their offices and official powers, dignities, and privileges, though they might not be wholly cut off from communion at the altar, in the prayers and eucharist. For often times there might be things, which to do would subject a clergyman to discipline, but not a layman, and again even when a clergyman did things which would subject a layman to public penance, it might be that suspension or degradation from his official station would be as severe a discipline for him, as excommunication and public penance to a layman. Hence we find the expressions, commonly applied to excommunication in general, often used with reference to the clergy in such a way as that they can only signify suspension or degradation.[1]

And accordingly we find that the clergy were commonly either suspended, or degraded from their office, but not punished in the way of ordinary excommunication. The Apostolical Canons ex-

[1] Babzamon, in Conc. Nic. can. 16. Zonares, in eundem. Albispan. Observat. lib. 1. cap. 2. Habert. Archierat. p. 746. Suicer. Thes. Eccles. Can. Apost. 6, 43, 45, 54, 57, 58, 59, 72.

pressly forbid the excommunication of the clergy, and allow only of their suspension, or degradation. The same is directed in the canons of Peter of Alexandria, and Basil.[1]

Yet both penalties were sometimes inflicted for very heinous offences. This appears from the same Apostolical Canons, in regard to the crime of simony.[2] It was certainly the practice of the Church in the time of Cyprian, who speaks of Novatus as being both degraded, and excommunicated.[3] And innumerable instances of the like may be found in the following times.

§ 237. *Of Suspension.*

There were three sorts of suspension to which the clergy were subject. Sometimes they were suspended from their share in maintenance allotted to the clergy from the oblations and revenues of the Church,—though still allowed to exercise their spiritual functions.

Sometimes they were suspended, not only from their share in the revenues, but also from the exercise of their office and functions. This was either partial and temporary, or total and perpetual. The temporary suspension was that by which they were prohibited from the exercise of their functions for a given period, after which they might resume them. The total suspension was more commonly called deposition or degradation.

§ 238. *Of Deposition or Degradation.*

By this the Church resumed entirely the authority and commission before given to a clergyman; and he was totally divested of the name and dignity, authority and power of his office. By some canons he is therefore said to be degraded, deprived and turned out of office; by others totally deposed, (παντελῶς καθαιρεῖσθαι), totally to fall from his office; to be un-ordained or dis-ordained; to be removed from and to cease to be of, the number of the clergy;—and finally to be reduced to lay-communion.

All the above expressions are too plain to have occasioned any misunderstanding, except the last—reducing to lay-communion—which has been taken by some to mean reducing them to commu-

---

[1] Can. Apost. can. 25. Pet. Alex. can. 10. Basil. can. 3, 32, 51. [2] Can. Apost. 29, 30, 51. [3] Cypr. Ep. 49. al. 52. ad Cornel.

nion in one kind of the elements. But this notion proceeds upon a begging of the question in regard to laymen being denied the communion in both kinds, and is destitute of proof. Another supposition has been made, that it meant thrusting the clergy out to commence with the laity without the rails of the chancel. This was true enough in point of fact, but does not explain the full meaning of the phrase.

The true import of it, as Chamier has rightly shown against Bellarmin,[1] is the total degradation of the clergyman from his office—and reducing him to the state and condition of a layman. His name was stricken from the roll of the clergy; he was deprived of the office and authority of a clergyman, and of the name and title; and in all respects reputed and treated as a layman. Hence if he presumed to act in the capacity of a clergyman all his acts were null and void, and no other than the actions of a layman.

Those who were thus deposed from the sacred office were rarely ever restored to it. It was sometimes done in peculiar and very extraordinary cases. The council of Nice allowed the Novatian clergy, returning to the Catholic Church, to resume their sacred offices, and the African fathers allowed the same to the Donatists, with a charitable view to put an end to those schisms. But such were exceptions to the general rule.

The indelible character of the sacred office therefore meant no more than that if such deposed ministers were ever restored to the exercise of the sacred office they did not need a new ordination. Yet it was fully in the power of the Church to cut them off from their office, and deprive them, for as long as she choose, of all lawful right to act in the clerical office. Still when she gave them again a commission to exercise the clerical functions, it was not thought necessary to re-ordain them. Sometimes however, if they continued contumacious, such deposed ministers were also excommunicated and denied even the communion of laymen.

§ 239. *Meaning of the punishment called "delivering up to the secular court."*

This phrase among the modern canonists signifies the delivering up, after degradation, a clergyman who had committed any great

---

[1] Chamier. de Eucharist. lib. x. cap. 3.

offence to be punished by the civil courts. But in the old law, *curia* denotes a municipal corporation, as well as a civil court, and in this corporation were some respectable, and some servile officers; and when a clergyman was degraded, he was sometimes obliged to serve the corporation in some of these offices, which effectually precluded his ever being restored to the clerical office, and also his attaining any respectable office in the civil courts.

But it was also true that when a clergyman committed any offence cognizable by the civil courts, he was as a matter of course, degraded from the ministry, and turned over to the secular courts to be punished as a member of the commonwealth according to the quality of his offence.

§ 240. *The Communio peregrina, or communion of strangers.*

This word appears as a technical term in reference to a peculiar kind of punishment inflicted on the clergy, for some special offences; but not till the time of the council of Riez, in the year 439, and the subject would not be taken up in this work, except that it appears to refer to a punishment equally practised in the early times. It has by some writers been confounded with lay-communion; but was different from it, because clergymen subjected to it, could after penance be allowed to resume their office, which was not the case in regard to those degraded.[1]

Nor was it communion in one kind,—nor communion at the hour of death,—nor the going on a pilgrimage by way of penance, which was a thing unknown in the ancient Church,—nor any private and peculiar communion for strangers; all which suppositions have been made.

But it was that kind of communion, to which strangers, travelling without their proper credentials, that is, without commendatory letters, testifying to their being in peace and full communion with the Church—were admitted by foreign churches. By the rules of the Church, no person when travelling, was to be admitted to the eucharist in other churches, unless he had with him such letters from his own church; but was only allowed to be present at the ante-communion service, and to receive such charitable subsistence from the Church as was given to strangers in need.

[1] Conc. Agathen. can. 5.

Clergymen reduced to the *communio peregrina* as a punishment, were therefore treated by their own churches just as the Church treated such strangers. This seems to be the true account of the meaning of the phrase. At all events such was the treatment of strangers travelling without letters in the earliest times of the Church;[1] and such the most probable interpretation of this language as applied to clergymen reduced in their own church to the communion of strangers. This punishment was only a temporary suspension from their office; because it is plain they might be restored after satisfaction made, or private penance. But after degradation and public penance they could never be restored.

§ 241. *Some other special and peculiar ways of inflicting punishment on the clergy.*

1. Among these may be mentioned a suspension from the exercise of their official functions, while they were still allowed to retain the title and other privileges of the clergy.[2]

2. Sometimes they were degraded from a higher to a lower order of the ministry. Thus the council of Nice when re-admitting the schismatical Novatian bishops, returning to the communion of the Catholic Church, allowed them to officiate only as presbyters, unless any bishops might choose to appoint them to the office of *chorepiscopus* under them.[3] But the rule was not uniform in the Church.

3. Sometimes they were deprived of a part of their office and allowed to exercise the rest. Thus the council of Neocæsarea debars presbyters in certain cases from administering the eucharist, but allows the exercise of the other functions of the ministry.[4]

4. Sometimes a bishop was deprived of jurisdiction over a part of his flock, and allowed to retain the rest.[5]

5. In Africa, it was a customary punishment for offending bishops to deprive them of their precedence and right of seniority, rendering them incapable of succeeding to the primacy, as we learn from Augustine;[6] who also gives another instance of African discipline

---

[1] Canon. Apost. 33. Conc. Antioch. can. 7. [2] Conc. Ancyr. can. 1. Ibid. can. 2. Conc. Nic. can. 8. [3] Conc. Nic. can. 8. [4] Conc. Neocæs. can. 9. [5] August. Ep. 261. [6] August. Ep. 261.

by which a bishop was sometimes confined to the communion of his own church, and other churches were forbidden to receive him to their communion.

6. And sometimes they were removed from a greater to a less diocese, as a species of tacit disgrace for negligence in duty.

7. There was a punishment much of the same kind, mentioned by the council of Trullo, as applied to the clergy in general, that of depriving them of their seniority and placing them in the lowest seat among their order. Thus this council mentions it as the punishment of those deacons, who through pride or ambition presumed to sit before presbyters, because they might have some more honourable ecclesiastical office.[1] The second council of Nice makes a rule for such of the clergy as through haughtiness insulted another, that they should be thrust down to the lowest seat among those of their own order.[2]

8. The inferior orders were sometimes rendered incapable of promotion or admission to any higher order.[3]

9. The clergy were sometimes prohibited from the public exercise of their office, while they were allowed to officiate in private. This could not however have been a very general practice, as it is mentioned by no author but Basil.[4]

There were some other punishments sometimes inflicted upon delinquent clergymen, which came in at a later period, and need not be particularly mentioned here, as shutting up in monasteries, scourging, &c.

§ 242. *Of the crimes which rendered clergymen liable to the forementioned kinds of discipline.*

In general it may be remarked that all crimes which in the case of laymen were punished with excommunication, were in the case of the clergy punished with suspension or degradation.—Sometimes, as has been observed, with both degradation and excommunication.

But besides those crimes which were common both to clergy and

---

[1] Conc. Trull. can. 7. [2] Conc. Nic. ii. can. 5. [3] Conc. Tolet. i. can. 1. [4] Basil. can. 17.

laity, there were particular offences that might be committed by the clergy against the rules of their order, which incurred the censures peculiar to the clergy.

I. There were some things which *ab initio* rendered a clergyman's ordination null and void,—and which being discovered subjected him to degradation. Of these may be mentioned, 1. *ignorance* or incompetency in the knowledge of religion, and *heterodoxy*. Hence the canons order that if any one is ordained without due examination and without the requisite qualifications in this respect, he should be deposed and likewise the bishop who ordained him. 2. Certain *immoralities previous* to ordination precluded from orders, and incurred suspension or degradation, if through ignorance or surreptitious practices ordination had been bestowed.—Also any transgression of the rules made in regard to ordination. 3. There were some things in men's *outward circumstances* to which the same rule applied; such as having been in the military profession, being slaves, being tied to the service of the state, &c. If any such happened to have been ordained through ignorance of these circumstances they were to be deposed.

II. There were some things which rendered duly ordained clergymen in the performance of their office liable to these censures.[1]

1. Contempt of the canons of the Church.[2]

2. Negligence or sloth in the performance of their spiritual duties. This was to be punished with suspension, and if continued with degradation.[3]

3. Neglecting to use the public liturgy, or any part of it, the Lord's prayer, and the stated hymns, &c. There are various canons of different councils on this point, establishing the different parts of divine service, and ordering suspension or excommunication for violation of them.[4]

4. Making any alteration in the form of baptism, or any material alteration in the established manner of administering the sacraments, as neglecting the trine immersion. These offences by the Apostolical Canons, incur degradation.[5]

---

[1] Conc. Carth. i. can. 14. and other councils. [2] Conc. Carth. i. can. 14. [3] Canon. Apost. 53. [4] Conc. Tolet. iv. can. 9. 12, 13, 14, and 16. [5] Canon. Apost. 49. and 50.

5. Neglecting to attend the daily divine service, even when not obliged to perform it. This if persisted in after admonition, subjected to deposition, or, by some canons, to the communion of strangers.[1]

6. Engaging in secular offices. Those who did so were to be deposed. The Apostolical Canons specify military offices, the council of Carthage stewardships; but the Apostolical Canons, as well as others, forbid all civil or secular offices in general terms, and make no allowance for a clergyman engaging in a secular employment, unless in some special cases of manifest necessity for his maintenance, or of charity for the glory of God, and the honour or advantage of the Church.[2]

7. Deserting their own pastoral charge to go to another, without license of the bishop. This was regarded as a special violation of good order, and those guilty of it, and after admonition persisting, were deposed. And any bishop, entertaining such were to be excommunicated. So say the Apostolical Canons, and various other canons.[3]

8. Officiating after censure and suspension by a synod, and before restitution, incurred total deposition and excommunication. This rule was first decreed by the Apostolical Canons,[4] and afterwards by the council of Antioch more explicitly, "that if any bishop who is deposed by a synod, or any presbyter or deacon who is deposed by his bishop, presume to officiate, they shall have no hopes of being restored even by another synod, nor any room left for satisfaction: and all that communicate with them shall be cast out of the Church, if they do it after being apprized of the sentence against them.[5] This was confirmed by the great council of Chalcedon, as being a standing rule of the universal Church.[6]

9. Appealing from the censure of a provincial synod, to churches or synods out of the province in which the party lived.[7]

10. Refusing to end controversies by the judgment of the bishop and resorting to a secular tribunal.[8] This was also confirmed by the great council of Chalcedon.

---

[1] Conc. Tolet. i. can. 5. Conc. Agathen. can. 2. [2] Can. Apost. 81 and 82. see can. 7. Conc. Carth. i. can. 6. Conc. Chalced. can. 3. [3] Canon. Apost. 15 and 16. [4] Canon. Apost. 28. [5] Conc. Antioch, can. 4. [6] Conc. Chalc. act. 4. [7] Conc. Milvet. can. 22. Cod. Afric. cap. 135. [8] Conc. Carth. iii. can. 6.

11. Being re-baptized or re-ordained. The Apostolical Canons order that if any bishop, presbyter, or deacon, shall receive a second ordination, both the ordainer and the ordained shall be deposed, except it appear that his first ordination was given by heretics.[1] So likewise they order that if any bishop or presbyter presumed to give a second baptism after a true one once received, he should be degraded.[2] The council of Rome under Felix III, decreed that if any bishop, presbyter or deacon, suffered himself to be re-baptized, he should be degraded, and excommunicated all his life, and not even allowed to be present at the service of the catechumens, and be admitted only to lay-communion at the hour of death.[3]

12. Denying or concealing their clerical character, from Jews and heathen—especially in times of persecution. This was punished with excommunication, as a sort of renunciation of Christianity. Such, however, upon penitence are ordered to be received as laymen.[4]

13. Publishing apochryphal books—or books written under false names, as sacred and pious writings, to the deceiving or corrupting of the people. This incurred deposition.[5]

14. Superstitious abstinence from flesh, wine, marriage, or any of the like lawful or innocent things. This, when done, not from expediency for the sake of self-discipline, but out of a false and heretical opinion that they were wrong or impure, was, if persisted in after admonition, punished with degradation.[6]

15. On the other hand it was the custom of the Church, almost to the time of Augustine, to forbid the eating of blood, and by the ancient laws of the Church clergymen were obliged to abstain from it under penalty of degradation. This rule proceeded upon the prohibition made to the Gentile converts by the apostles as recorded in Acts. In the time of Augustine it was however regarded as a temporary injunction,—having relation to certain heathen idolatrous

---

[1] Can. Apost. 68. [2] Ibid. 47. [3] Felic. Ep. i. cap. 2. [4] Can. Apost. 62. [5] Ibid. 60. Tertull. de Bapt. cap. 17. [6] Canon. Apost. 51. 53. Conc. Ancyræ. can. 15. Gangr. can. 2. What ought now a days to be done to such as not only hold similar doctrines, but force them upon men's consciences by all the moral pains and penalties in their power to impose.

practices, on account of which, and to distinguish Christians from the heathen, it was given by the apostles.[1]

16. Contemning the Fasts and Festivals of the Church. This was punished with degradation.[2]

17. Not observing the rule about Easter. This rule was settled in the Church by the council of Nice, in order to put an end to disputes; and after that, it was not esteemed a matter of indifference, but all churches were required to conform to it. Contempt and violation of this rule was therefore by the council of Antioch punished with excommunication both in the case of laymen, and clergymen.[3]

18. Wearing an indecent and unsuitable garb and habit, was by some canons punishable with censure and admonition.

19. Gaming, hunting, keeping hawks, and hounds, and following unbecoming diversions, horse-racing, dicing, acting plays, frequenting the games of the circus, &c. All these things as unsuitable and injurious to the proper influence of the clerical office, were included in the general prohibition against secular employments; but there were also some special canons forbidding them under pain of canonical censure.[4]

20. Residing with women not of their near kindred, and especially under such circumstances as to expose to scandal. The second council of Arles excommunicates every clergyman above the order of deacons, that retains any woman as a resident and companion in his house, except a grandmother, mother, sister, daughter, or wife after her conversion.[5]

21. Retaining an adulterous wife. "If the wife of a layman," says the council of Neocæsarea, "is convicted of adultery, the husband shall never attain to the ministry of the clergy. If she commits adultery after his ordination, he must put her away or quit his ministry."[6]

22. Non Residence. Unnecessary or prolonged absence from their flocks subjected the clergy to suspension, or degradation, or excommunication according to the nature of the case.

---

[1] August. contr. Faust. lib. 32. cap. 13. [2] Canon. Apost. 69. Conc. Gangr. can. 19 and 20. Laod. can. 34 and 35. [3] Conc. Antioch. can. 1. [4] Conc. Agathen, can. 4. Eliber. can. 79. Laod. can. 54. [5] Conc. Arelat. ii. can. 3. [6] Conc. Neocæs. can. 8.

23. Holding livings in two dioceses. The council of Chalcedon expressly orders such to be degraded as, from avarice or ambition, seek to have their names enrolled in the clerical lists of two dioceses.[1]

24. Needless frequenting of public taverns. This is forbidden under pain of suspension.[2]

25. Living in familiarity with Jewish and heathen philosophers, and heretics, incurred excommunication.[3]

26. Rejecting too rigorously lapsers who sued for penance, incurred deposition.[4]

27. Want of charity to indigent clergymen. The breach of kindness and charity to the distressed of their own order, was punished with degradation and excommunication.[5]

§ 243. *Rules of discipline particularly applied to bishops.*

Besides those general things which subjected all the clergy to ecclesiastical censure, there were some rules having respect to the particular orders of the clergy. In the first place as it respects bishops violating the peculiar duties of their office.

1. If bishops granted ordination contrary to the laws of the Church—by ordaining a bishop for a see already filled—by uniting with two other bishops to ordain a bishop without the consent of the rest of the provincial bishops and metropolitan. Not only the bishops thus ordained, but those that ordained him, were to be deposed. If a bishop ordained those that had been baptized by heretics—or any of his own kindred being unworthy of orders—or in another's diocese, he was liable to be deposed, as well as those ordained.[6] If a bishop ordained one who had done public penance in the Church, the person ordained was deposed, and the bishop deprived of the power of ordination.[7]

2. Bishops neglecting to put the laws of discipline in execution, were liable to deposition.

3. Also for dividing their bishoprics and erecting new sees out of them, without the concurrence of the Church in council.

4. Unreasonably neglecting to attend the meeting of provincial

---

[1] Conc. Chalced. can. 10. [2] Conc. Laodic, can. 24. Carth. iii. can. 27. [3] Sozom. lib. vi. cap. 25. [4] Canon. Apost. can. 52. [5] Can. Apost. 59. [6] Felic. iii. Ep. i. cap. 6. Can. Apost. 96. 35. [7] Conc. Carth. iv. can. 68.

councils, subjected the offending bishop to be deprived of the communion of the rest of the bishops.

5. Bishops guilty of oppressing the people with unjust exactions, were by a peculiar provision of the African Church, to be punished by being deprived of that part of their diocese which they had oppressed.[1]

6. Bishops harbouring and abetting those clergymen who had left their own dioceses without leave, were by the Apostolical Canons subjected to suspension,[2] by the African code restricted to the communion of their own church,[3] and by the council of Antioch left to be punished by the provincial synod.[4]

§ 244. *Particular rules relating to Chorepiscopi, Presbyters, and Deacons.*

Chorepiscopi, exceeding their commission, and presuming to ordain presbyters and deacons, without a special license from the city bishop, or in any other way usurping the functions of an independent bishop, were liable to be suspended and degraded.[5]

In like manner, ***presbyters*** in any way usurping the episcopal functions were liable to suspension and deposition.[6]

And the same rule obtained in regard to *deacons* transcending the official powers of their office.[7]

---

[1] August. Ep. 261. [2] Can. Apost. 16. [3] Conc. Carth. v. can. 13. [4] Conc. Antioch. can. 3. [5] Conc. Antioch. can. 10. [6] Conc. Sardic. can. 20. Conc. Bracar. i. can. 37. [7] Conc. Arelat. ii. can. 15.

CHAPTER FIFTH.

THE SEVERAL ORDERS OF PENITENTS; THE MODES OF PUBLIC PENANCE, AND THE SEVERAL STAGES OF REPENTANCE, IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

§ 245. *Penitents divided into four classes.*

We have thus far considered the discipline of the Church upon obstinate offenders to bring them to repentance and to preserve the purity of the Church. If those who were excommunicated continued in their sins, or disregarded the censures of the Church and did not seek to be reconciled to her, the Church treated them as totally cut off as heathens. But if they submitted themselves to the sentence of the Church, and sought to be reconciled and restored to communion the Church put them upon a course of public penance. Those excommunicated persons, who thus sought reconciliation, were called Penitents. The performance of penance was a matter of considerable length of time, in order the better to test the sincerity and steadfastness of the penitents, to testify the abhorrence of the Church of their sins, and to give the penitents opportunity of giving impressive testimony of their sorrow, and their submission to the wisdom of the Church.

For this reason the penitents were divided into four distinct orders or classes, called *the mourners, the hearers, the prostrators, and the co-standers.*"[1]

§ 246. *The Flentes or Mourners.*

This was the first class of penitents, who might indeed almost be considered as candidates for penance, rather than as penitents strictly speaking. Their station was in the church-porch, where they lay prostrate begging the prayers of the faithful as they went in, and begging to be admitted to do public penance in the church. Thus says Tertullian, "they were used to fall at the feet of the presbyter, and kneel to the friends of God, and intreat all the brethren to

[1] By the Greeks, Προσκλαίοντες, Ακροωμένοι, Ὑποπίπτοντες, and Συνιστάμενοι; by the Latins, *Flentes, Audientes, Substrati,* and *Consistentes.*

recommend their petition, and intercede with heaven for them."[1] So the canons of Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Basil; and the like instances we find in Socrates, Eusebius, and Ambrose;[2] some canons pass over this part of the mode of proceeding, as preliminary to penance proper,[3] yet from the others, we must consider it as the introductory part of penance. Basil says the penitents were to weep before the gate of the church for a year, begging the prayers of the faithful, and intreating to be admitted further within the church to perform and complete a regular course of penance.

§ 247. *The Audientes or Hearers.*

When their petition was accepted they were said to be admitted to penance, to have liberty to pass through the several stages of penance, appointed by the Church for the probation and trial of such as pretended to sorrow and penitence for any notorious or scandalous offence. This is the meaning of the phrases *pœnitentiam dare*, *pœnitentiam accipere*. When admitted to this state penitents were termed *audientes* or *hearers;* because they had the privilege of entering within the church, and of hearing the Scriptures read, and the sermon preached; but they were obliged to depart before any of the prayers began. There are various canons prescribing how long penitents were to continue in this stage, a year, two, three, or more years, according to the nature of the offence. Their station was in the *narthex* of the church proper, in the lowest part of the church, where they stood to hear the Scriptures and sermon, and were then immediately dismissed along with such catechumens, Jews, heathen, &c., as were called hearers only.[4]

§ 248. *Substrati, kneelers, or prostrators.*

The third order of penitents, were called γονυκλίνοντες and ὑποπίπτοντες, *genuflectentes* and *substrati*, that is *kneelers or prostrators*, because they were allowed to stay after the sermon was ended and join in certain prayers which were offered for them, whilst they

---

[1] Tertull. de Pœnitent. cap. 9. [2] Greg. Thaum. can. 11.—Basil. can. 22.—Ambros. ad Virg. Laps. cap. 8.—Socrat. lib. iii. cap. 13.—Euseb. lib. v. cap. 28. [3] Conc. Nic. can. 11 and 12. Conc. Ancyr. can. 4, 6, 9. [4] Conc, Nic. can. 11 and 12.—Conc. Ancyr. can. 4, 6, 9.—Greg. Thaumat. can. 11.—Basil. can. 75. Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 5.

were kneeling or prostrate, and to receive the bishop's imposition of hands and a benedictory prayer which he offered for them. The forms of these prayers have been given in the account of the ante-communion service. Their station was in the nave or body of the church, near the ambo, or reading-desk. Some canons style this class penitents simply, and by way of emphasis, because the greatest part of the penitential acts and offices were performed while they remained in this class.[1]

§ 249. *Consistentes, or Co-standers.*

This was the last order of penitents, and thus named, from their being permitted to remain, after all other classes had been dismissed, and see the celebration of the eucharist, though not to commmunicate themselves. This is sometimes spoken of as communicating in prayers only.[2]

These were the several classes of penitents. But to get a clearer and more impressive view of the ancient discipline, both as testing the sincerity of men's repentance, and casting off from the Church the scandal which their offences might otherwise bring upon it,—some other things relating to the manner of performing penance, its duration, &c., remain to be noticed.

§ 250 *Ceremonies of penance.*

When the desire of an excommunicated offender to do penance was accepted, the first ceremony of admitting to it, was that he should receive imposition of hands from the bishop. This ceremony was performed at or immediately previous to their admission to the Church as hearers. The council of Agde mentions also their receiving from the bishop a piece of sackcloth to cover their heads.[3] Other canons and writers also speak of it as the rule for penitents to appear in sackcloth with ashes on their heads.[4] And this was required during the whole time of their passing through the various stages of penance. This is always the custom referred to by ancient

---

[1] Conc. Laod. can. 19. [2] Conc. Nic. can. 11. Ancyr. can. 4. [3] Con. Agather. can. 15. [4] Euseb. lib. v. cap. 28. Conc. Tolet. can. 12.

writers when they speak of penitents changing their garb and appearing in the mournful habit of repentance.

Some think that *Ash-Wednesday* received its name from being the special day for receiving penitents; but of this there is no proof. Penitents might be received at other times. There were some peculiar ceremonies observed in regard to penitents on *Ash-Wednesday*, different from their treatment at other parts of the year, which may be noticed here.

On the first day of Lent all penitents received at that time, or admitted previously, presented themselves to the bishop at the doors of the Church, clothed in sackcloth, barefooted, with dejected looks and down cast faces. They were then brought within the Church, and the bishop and all the clergy, falling prostrate on the ground, recited the *fifty-first* or penitential psalm with tears. Then the bishop rising from prayer, gives them imposition of hands, puts ashes on their heads, then covers their heads with sackcloth, declaring with sighs and groans, that as Adam was cast out of Paradise, so they for their sins were cast out of the Church. Then he commanded the inferior clergy to drive them out of the church; which was done.

Another thing observed in entering upon penance was that men were obliged to cut off their hair, and women wear their hair dishevelled, or to wear a certain penitential veil.[1]

Penitents were likewise obliged to abstain from bathing, feasting and other innocent diversions of life, and to exercise themselves in acts of private mortification and fasting. Especially they were to observe all the public fasts of the Church with great strictness.

By the second council of Arles they were not allowed to marry during the period of penance.[2] By the next canon of the same council, married persons were not to be admitted to penance except by the consent of both husband and wife.

Penitents were obliged to kneel at all times in the Church, and never to stand during those offices, or on those days when the rest of the congregation stood.

They were also obliged to exercise themselves in special acts of charity and liberality to the poor: and in some churches to minister to the Church in burying the dead, and in attending on the sick.

---

[1] Conc. Agathen. can. 15. Optat. lib. ii. p. 59. Hieron. Ep. 30. [2] Conc. Arelat. ii. can. 21.

§ 251. *Exomologesis, or confession; not the same thing as auricular confession.*

The whole method and ceremonies of penance, were so many offices of public confession and bewailing of their sins; and mingled with them were many offices of public verbal confession. Hence we often find the word *Exomologesis* or confession used to signify the performance of penance.

But it has been greatly used by Romanists to interpret this of *auricular* or private confession, as now practised in that church, and imposed as essential to salvation. There is no ground whatever for such an interpretation, as has been abundantly proved by many able and learned writers.[1]

§ 252. *Strictness and severity of Penance.*

1. During the early ages of the Church and for four or five centuries, no person was ordinarily allowed to do penance twice. Those who fell into such sins as subjected them to discipline, after they had once done public penance, were ordinarily rejected from the communion the rest of their lives.[2]

2. Sometimes too offenders were kept in the state of penance all their lives, and absolved and admitted to communion only at the hour of death as has already been noticed in speaking particularly of certain crimes. The ordinary course of penance often held men for ten, fifteen and twenty years in going through its several stages; but for some enormous offences it was protracted all their lives.

3. Such as were absolved and admitted to communion when apparently at the point of death, were obliged to perform their ordinary penance, if it happened that they recovered. It was a frequent practice of the Church to admit again to her communion penitents in all the various stages, if they were apparently on their death bed. And such were put into the same class to which they before belonged, if they recovered.

4. Some were however denied communion to the last, and never admitted to the Church. This rule was applied to such as had been

[1] See the Appendix for a particular discussion of this subject—taken from Bingham's *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*. [2] Tertull. de Pœnit. cap. 7.

guilty of very atrocious, monstrous and scandalous crimes,—also to such as persisted in impenitence till near their death, not asking for admission to penance.[1]

§ 253. *Discretion allowed to the Bishops.*

It may be observed however, that a great deal of discretion was allowed to bishops, in apportioning the severity and continuance of penance. In some extraordinary cases they admitted the same persons to do penance twice. In other cases, they sometimes moderated the ordinary term of penance, in others increased it.[2]

This power in the bishops to abate the ordinary term of penance was the true and only ancient notion of an *indulgence*, a thing which in modern times has been so abused by the Romish church.

The bishops also had the power not only to grant indulgence by diminishing the ordinary term of penance, but they might also in some degree alter and diminish the nature of it. Thus the council of Ancyra ordering the penance for relapsing deacons, allows the bishops a discretion in restoring them to such parts of their office as he might think fit, according to the meekness and fidelity which they might evince after absolution.

Hence we may understand the phrase *pœnitentia legitima, plena, et justa*, a legal, full, and just penance, to refer to the actual performance of the ordinary penance, not diminished by any indulgence. Bingham, however, understands it to mean such a performance of penance as shall so truly convince the bishop of their sincerity and contrition, as that he may shorten it.

---

[1] Conc. Sardic. can. 2. Conc. Eliber. can. 18. Cypr. Ep. 55. ad Anton. Conc. Arelat. can. 23. [2] Conc. Nic. can. 12. Conc. Ancyr. can. 5.

CHAPTER SIXTH.

OF ABSOLUTION, OR THE MANNER OF RECEIVING PENITENTS AGAIN TO THE COMMUNION OF THE CHURCH.

§ 154. *Nature of Church absolution in general; only ministerial, not absolute; sorts of it.*

Having seen the nature and manner of penitential discipline, as exercised towards the excommunicated, it remains to notice how the Church proceeded in restoring them to communion when their term of penance was completed. First, however, something should be said of the nature of absolution in general. The Church never claimed any other than a simply ministerial power in this. To absolve absolutely belonged only to the omniscient Head of the Church; and the ministers of Christ could only declare the divine absolution to such as were truly penitent, and the Church only claimed that such declaration and form of absolution was the channel of divine pardon to the penitent.[1]

The means of grace, or several offices wherein this ministry of the Church conveyed the remissions of sins, were commonly reckoned under five heads: 1. the absolution of baptism, 2. of the eucharist, 3. of the word and doctrine, 4. of the imposition of hands and prayer, and 5. the absolution of reconciling penitents and receiving them again to the communion of the Church.

The first or sacramental absolution of baptism had no reference to penitential discipline, which was always exercised upon persons that had been baptized, and were therefore not to receive it again. Yet baptism was regarded as a sacramental absolution or remission of sins, and often, as has been shown, went by this name.[2]

The sacramental absolution of the eucharist, though given to penitents when restored to communion, yet was of course not peculiar to them, being received by all baptized persons not excommunicated. It was a general absolution. It was also particularly an absolution to penitents, as it loosed the bonds of excommunication without any

---

[1] Usher, answer to Jesuit's Challenge, p. 79. &c. [2] Conc. Carth. ap. Cypr. n. 19. August. de Bapt. lib. v. cap. 21. and others.

other formality, when given to penitents in danger of death, and not in a condition to go through the other formalities.[1]

The third sort of absolution was both general, in as far as through the grace of God it ministered to the working of penitence and faith in them that heard the word of God,—and also formal in regard to penitents when admitted to be hearers, inasmuch as it was a step in their progress towards a full reconciliation with the Church.

The fourth or precatory absolution with imposition of hands, was used as a concomitant of the others, and was frequently used in the various stages of penance, in the progress of penitents towards complete or judicial absolution and full communion with the Church, as well as used at that last complete reconciliation, now to be more particularly noticed.

§ 255. *Judicial absolution or complete reconciliation of Penitents.*

When penitents had gone through their penance to the satisfaction of the Church they were restored to full communion, by the last great reconciliatory absolution. This was anciently granted to none who had not completed the full term of penance—unless in cases of danger of death. Indulgences or abatement of the term of penance, were never bought and sold.

The manner of reconciliation was usually this. The penitent was brought to the altar clothed in sackcloth as at the first, and there with solemn prayers and tears and imposition of hands received absolution and admission to the privileges of full communion. Sometimes when the crime had been very heinous or scandalous, the absolution was given in a more public part of the church, near the reading desk in view of all the people.

But whenever given it was by imposition of hands with a form of *supplication*, and never till the twelfth century was there used any indicative form, as *Ego te absolve*, *I absolve you*.[2]

A form of this absolving prayer may be given from St. James' Liturgy,[3] and is substantially the same as may be found in other authors.

"O Lord Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, thou Shepherd and

---

[1] Conc. Carth. iv. can. 76 and 78. [2] Morinus, de Pœnitent lib. viii. cap. 8. 9. [3] Liturg. Jacobi. in Bibl. Pat. Gr. Lat. tom. ii. p. 23.

Lamb, that takest away the sins of the world, that forgavest the debt of the two debtors, and grantedst remission of sins to the sinful woman and gavest to the sick of the palsy both a cure and pardon of sins, remit, blot out and pardon our sins, both voluntary and involuntary, whatever we have done wittingly or unwittingly by transgression and disobedience, which thy Spirit knoweth better than we ourselves. And whereinsoever thy servants have erred from thy commandments in word or deed, as men carrying flesh about them, and living in the world or seduced by the instigation of Satan; or whatever curse or peculiar *anathema* they are fallen under. I pray, and beseech thy ineffable goodness to absolve them with thy word, and remit their curse and *anathema* according to thy mercy. O Lord and Master hear my prayer for thy servants; Thou that forgettest injuries, overlook all their failings, pardon their offences both voluntary and involuntary, and deliver them from eternal punishment. For Thou art He that hast commanded us, saying, 'Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven;' because Thou art our God, the God that canst have mercy and save and forgive sins; and to Thee with the Eternal Father, and the quickening Spirit, belongs glory now and forever, world without end. *Amen.*"

§ 256. *Some things peculiar to the reconciliation of certain heretics and schismatics.*

The baptism of some heretics and schismatics was considered so defective, that they were sometimes reconciled not only by imposition of hands, but with the holy unction or chrism added to it.

Others having been baptized by such heretics as either corrupted the true matter or form of baptism, were required to be baptized anew. But all other heretics or schismatics, having fallen from the Catholic Church, and being restored through penance, were reconciled in the ordinary way; except that sometimes ringleaders were required to bring back those whom they had led astray, as far as this was possible.[1] Sometimes too such were required to give the Church all needful information concerning the factions which they

[1] Tertull. de Præser. cap. 30.

left behind them. Sometimes they were required to anathematize their errours and abjure them in writing.[1]

§ 257. *The time of Absolution.*

This was ordinarily the day of the Saviour's passion, or rather the day on which he was betrayed. Ambrose says that on the day when our Lord gave himself for us, it was usual in the Church to relax men's penance or grant them absolution. The Thursday before Easter was therefore the usual day, except in case of sickness and danger of death, when a penitent might be reconciled on any day.

It may be observed, finally, that there were two cases in which the Church in a certain sense received penitents to her communion after their death. 1. When penitents, diligently and humbly going through their prescribed course, died suddenly, or in circumstances where no minister was at hand to give them absolution. 2. When innocent men by some prevailing faction had been overborne and unjustly excommunicated, and were never received to communion. In these cases the Church ordered the names of such to be inserted in the *dyptichs*, and that they should be recognized in the prayers and memorials as being in the peace and communion of the Church.[3]

§ 258. *The minister of Discipline.*

The power of ecclesiastical discipline was always lodged in the bishop; though in this as in other things, he was to act with the presbytery. And so far as the bishop was able he was required to retain the administration of discipline in his own hands. But because the bishop could not ordinarily attend to the whole of this, the presbyters as his proper assistants, received commission from him, either general or particular, to grant the absolution of baptism, and the eucharist, and of word and doctrine to all that needed. In regard to public discipline and the final reconciling of penitents, presbyters were more restrained. The intermediate imposition of hands was however frequently committed to them. They also often re-

---

[1] Conc. Nic. can. 8. Conc. Gangr. in Procem. Conc. Arelat. ii. can 9.
[2] Ambros. Ep. 33. [3] Conc. Carth. iv. can 79. Theodor. lib. v. cap. 34.

ceived commission to give the final reconciliation privately, and sometimes in the church to penitents at the point of death.[1]

This same power, in like extreme cases, was sometimes granted also to deacons.[2] Neither presbyters nor deacons were however to presume to reconcile penitents without a full and explicit commission from the bishop, under severe penalty.

---

[1] Conc. Carth. ii. can. 4. p. 40.

[2] Conc. Eliber. can. 32.—Cypr. Ep. 13. al. 18.

BOOK SEVENTH.

CHAPTER FIRST.

OF THE FESTIVALS OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

§ 259. *Distinction of Festivals.*

In treating of the Festivals of the ancient Church, it will be proper to advert to a distinction which came in after the time of Constantine, when Christianity became established by the State. By this, festivals were divided into those purely ecclesiastical, those purely civil, and those which were both. All Sundays of the year, and the fifteen days of Easter, were festivals both ecclesiastical and civil; that is to say, the Church not only appointed those days to be observed by solemn religious worship and abstinence from secular labours, but the State also made them days of vacation for the civil courts and secular business. Purely ecclesiastical festivals were those appointed by the Church for religious assembly, but not entirely vacations from law suits and civil business. Purely civil festivals were simply vacations of the courts and public business, but not observed by the Church as days of religious service. Of this sort were the *feriæ æstivæ*, and *autumnales*, the thirty days of harvest, and vintage, the birth days of the emperors, &c. But of these it is not necessary to take notice. It falls within the scope of this work only to consider those festivals appointed by the Church.

§ 260. *Of the Lord's Day.*

The principal and most noted festival of the Church was the Lord's day, which was observed with great solemnity from the times of the apostles. Various passages of the New Testament show the practice of the apostles, and the custom of the Church in the apostolic age.[1] The same is illustrated by the passage of Pliny, who mentions the custom of Christians to assemble in the morning on a

[1] Acts. xx. 7. 1 Cor. xvi. 2. Rev. i. 10.

certain fixed day and sing hymns to Christ as to God, &c.[1] Ignatius, in the same age, plainly refers to the observance of the Lord's day, bidding the Magnesians not to sabbatize, but to lead a life agreeable to the Lord's day, on which our Life was raised from the dead;[2] which Clemens Alexandrinus explains in such a way as to show that the phrase, to lead a life according to the Lord's day, means to celebrate that day as a sacred religious festival.[3]

Justin Martyr styles it Sunday, adopting the pagan name in common use for the first day of the week; and Tertullian, answering the objection of the heathen that Christians worshipped the sun, says they indeed made Sunday a day of joy and worship, but for other reasons than to worship the sun, which was no part of their religion.[4] When writing to Christians, however, they commonly call it the Lord's day.

The Lord's day was observed as a solemn religious festival, by public worship and the celebration of the eucharist; of which a particular account has already been given.

The Church strictly forbid all secular labour and business, except works of evident necessity, or charity for the good of men and the glory of God. All games, shows, and secular amusements were also prohibited, which, as also all civil courts and public business, were likewise forbidden by the State after the time of Constantine.

It has already been seen that fasting was also forbidden on this day; and all the prayers, and public worship were performed standing.

The strictness with which the Lord's day was kept in the primitive Church, may be seen in the constant attendance required upon public worship; which nothing was to excuse a neglect of but evident necessity. Justin Martyr describes the great fidelity of the early Christians in celebrating the religious services of Sunday,[5] even in times of persecution and at the peril of their lives.[6] They also prepared for them by religious worship on the evening before, often protracted till late: and then began the service of the Lord's day very early in the morning.

---

[1] Plin. lib. x. Ep. 97. [2] Ignat. Ep. ad Magnes. n. 9. [3] Clem. Alex. strom. 7. [4] Just. Apol. ii. p. 99. Tertull. Apol. cap. 16. [5] Just. Apol. ii. p. 98. [6] Tertull. Apol. cap. 7.

§ 261. *Observation of the Sabbath, or Saturday, as a Festival.*

Saturday was observed as a day of religious worship throughout the Church—in some parts as a fast, but in the Eastern Church it was always kept as a festival, except the Saturday between Good Friday and Easter, which was observed as a fast, and called the *great Sabbath.*[1]

The Saturday was observed with the same religious services as the Lord's day, and the only differences in the manner of keeping it to be noted are, that it was not required that the worship should be performed standing, nor did the Church prohibit secular labours and business in the intervals of worship.[2]

The reason of this observance was probably at first a regard to the prejudices of Jewish converts, and the conviction that no evil could come from commemorating on Saturday the natural creation of the world, and on Sunday its new creation in Christ. This was doubtless the reason why it was kept as a festival in the Eastern church, that they received it from the Jewish converts, by whom it was so kept. The reason why it was kept as a fast in the Western church, is generally agreed to be that it was the day in which the Saviour lay buried in the tomb.

§ 262. *The Festival of Nativity.*

There was not anciently for the first ages a perfect agreement, especially in the Eastern churches, as to the day of the Nativity of our Lord. By some it was fixed on the twenty-fifth of our month of May.[3] But the greatest part of the Eastern church for three or four centuries kept it on the sixth of January, the same day now observed as a distinct festival under the name of *Epiphany.* These churches had, during that time, no distinct festival for the Epiphany, but celebrated on that same day both the birth of Christ, and his manifestation to the Gentiles, as well as two other particulars not now included in the commemorative design of the day, his baptism and first miracle and manifestation thereby of his divinity.[4] The

[1] August. Ep. 19. ad Hieron. p. 29. Const. Apost. lib. ii. cap. 59. [2] Socrat. lib. v. cap. 22. lib. vi. cap. 8. Conc. Laod. can. 49, and 51. can. 29. [3] Clem. Alex. Strom. i. p. 407. Basnage in Baron. p. 216. [4] Epiphan. Expos. Fide. 22.

two festivals were however, at length separated, and the Eastern churches in the time of Chrysostom, followed the practice of the Western—where the Nativity was always celebrated on the twenty-fifth December.[1] Both these festivals were however, often spoken of indifferently as the *Theophania*, *Epiphania*, and sometimes distinguished as the *prima* and *secunda nativitas*, the first and second Nativity.

The original of this festival is by some ancient writers derived from the apostolical age. Dr. Cave finds the first mention of it in the second century, but Bingham thinks he is mistaken in the authority he quotes. One thing is certain; Chrysostom says in his day it was a renowned festival of great antiquity in all the Church.[2]

It was every where kept with the greatest veneration as the principal Christian festival. Chrysostom styles it the most venerable, the metropolis and mother of all festivals. It was celebrated by public worship and the communion;[3] all fasting was strictly prohibited;[4] servants were to be allowed to rest from their labours;[5] and Christians were to assemble in the city churches, in preference to the lesser one, in order to enhance the solemnity of the day.[6]

§ 263. *Of the Festival of Epiphany.*

Where this was observed as a festival distinct from the Nativity, it was intended to commemorate the manifestation of Christ to the gentiles by the appearing of the star which conducted the wise men to Bethlehem. Hence the term *epiphania*, the *appearing*, *manifestation*. Some, as has been observed, connect other things with it—as the manifestation of the divinity of Christ at his baptism by the Holy Ghost descending, and the voice proclaiming "this is my beloved son,"—also, the manifesting of his divinity by his first miracle at Cana.[7]

From its being celebrated as commemorative of Christ's baptism, it was called ἡμέρα φώτων, *dies luminum, the day of lights*, baptism being called illumination.[8]

[1] August. de Trin. lib. iv. cap. 5. Cassian. Collat. x. cap. 2. Hieron in Ezek. cap. 1. [2] Chrysost. Hom. 31. de Bapt. Christi. [3] Chrysost. Hom. 31. de Philogonio. [4] Leo. Ep. 93. cap. 4. Conc. Bracar. i. can. 4. [5] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 33. [6] Conc. Aurel. i. can. 27. [7] August. Serm. 29 de Temp. Leo. Serm. in Epiphan. p. 25. Hieron. in Ezek. 1. Chrysost. Hom. 24. de Bapt. Chr. Greg. Naz. Orat. 39. [8] Greg. Naz. 40. de Bapt. Chr.

This day was celebrated as all the other great festivals. They had public worship, sermons, and the communion; and servants had liberty to rest from labour, and attend the services of the day.[1] In one respect it was distinguished in the Greek and African churches, being one of the three solemn seasons for administering baptism, which was not the case in the Western church.

One thing more may be mentioned in connection with this festival. It was customary to give notice on this day of the time for Easter, and all the moveable feasts and fasts of the year. Letters sent by the metropolitans to the bishops, announcing this, were usually read. These were called Paschal or Festival Letters, (*Epistolæ Paschales* and *Heortisticæ*) and consisted of a short discourse upon some useful topic, closing with an intimation of the time when Lent would begin, and Easter, and Whitsunday.

§ 264. *Of Easter, or the Paschal Festival.*

The ancients commonly included fifteen days in the solemnity of Easter, that is the week before, and the week following Easter Sunday—calling the former period the *paschal of the cross*, the latter the *paschal of the resurrection.*[2] It is not in order to speak now of the passion week, which was a part of the Lent fast, but only of the festival of Easter.

Concerning the exact time of Easter there were great disputes in the early Church. Some churches celebrated it on the same fixed and stated day every year.[3] Others kept it on the fourteenth day of the first moon in the new year, without regard to the day of the week on which it might fall. This was the custom of the Asiatic churches; and in the second century a difference arose between them and the rest of the world. For Pius, bishop of Rome about the year 147, had made a decree that Easter should be celebrated on the Lord's day. After a time Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, went to Rome to confer with Anicetus, then bishop, about it. They could not however, agree upon a uniform practice; still they parted in peace, agreeing to preserve communion with one another. Not long after the death of Polycarp, the dispute was renewed with great fierceness

---

[1] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 33. [2] Suicer. Thes. Eccles. tom i. p. 304. tom ii. p. 1014. [3] Epiphan. Hær. 50.

between the Romish and Asiatic churches, and broke up to a great extent the harmony and communion that had hitherto been preserved amidst their difference of practice on this point.

The council of Nice at length passed a decree that the festival of Easter should be kept on one and the same day by all.[1] There had been some canons before this time, as the Apostolical Canons, and those of the council of Arles, which enacted uniformity on the subject; but there was either no penalty for violation, or else it related only to the clergy. But after the great council of Nice had with a view to the good of the Church undertaken to fix upon a day, it was reputed schismatical to disregard an authority entitled to so much deference. The decree of this council was confirmed by that of Antioch, a few years later; and by various subsequent councils it is treated and punished as an heretical and schismatical act to violate this rule of uniformity.[2]

Yet where churches agreed in keeping the festival on the Lord's day, there was not a little embarrassment and difference occasioned by the different modes of calculation adopted. Thus it appears that in the year 387, Easter was kept on three several days, the Gallic churches observing the 21st of March, the Italian churches the 18th of April, and the Egyptians the 25th of April.[3] Very different and contrary cycles were in use; some following the Jewish cycle of eighty-four years; others, a cycle of sixteen; others, a cycle of twenty-five; and others a cycle of thirty. Epiphanius says the first Christians in Jerusalem followed the Jewish cyle.[4] This however was after a time found sometimes to bring two Easters into one and the same year. To remedy this defect, various other cycles, as above mentioned, were invented. Much confusion, disagreement, and controversy however prevailed on the subject: and to promote peace and uniformity the council of Nice having decided that this festival should be kept only on Sunday, is said also to have committed the care of the cycle and the yearly annunciation of Easter to the bishops of Alexandria.[5] This led to the formation of the cycle of nineteen years; but for a long time differences still prevailed.

---

[1] Socrat. lib. i. cap. 9. Sozom. lib. i. cap. 21. Euseb. Vit. Constant. lib. iii. cap. 14. [2] Conc. Antioch. can. 1. Laod. can. 7. August. Haer. 29 and 50. [3] Ambros. Ep. 83. Stillingfleet's Answer to Cressy, p. 323. [4] Epiphan. Hær. 70. [5] Leo. Ed. 63. ad Marcian.

§ 265. *Respect paid to Easter.*

All Christians however agreed in holding this festival in great reverence as commemorating the Lord's resurrection. Gregory Nazianzen styles it the "queen of days," "the festival of festivals;" and Chrysostom speaks of it as the "desirable festival of our salvation," "the foundation of our peace," "the destruction of death," &c.[1] Some ancient writers distinguished it from all other Lord's days in the year by calling it the *Dominica Gaudii*, the *Lord's day of joy*.[2]

The exercise of peculiar acts of charity was considered appropriate to this day. Liberal donations were made to the poor, and it was, more than on any time, common for masters to give freedom to their slaves. The Church prohibited her members from attending any public games or spectacles, from engaging in any civil suits, &c., during the whole period of this festival. After Christianity came to be established by the State, it was customary for the emperors on this festival to grant a general release and pardon to all prisoners and criminals, except in the case of certain very heinous offenders.

Religious services were not only had on Easter day, but during the whole week following. The Constitutions require servants to rest from their labours the whole week, that they might attend the sermons and other offices of divine worship.[3] The councils of Mascon and Trullo require the same.[4] By the civil laws also, after the time of Constantine, all public games were forbidden, and all proceedings at law, except in special and extraordinary cases.

The Sunday following Easter was called *Dominica*, *Nova*, and *Dominica in Albis*, *the Sunday of albs* or *white garments*, because the neophytes laid aside their white garments in the repository of the Church.[5]

§ 266. *Of Pentecost.*

The next great festival was that of Pentecost. This word sometimes signifies in the ancient writings the whole period of fifty days

---

[1] Greg. Naz. Orat. 19 in Fun. Patr. Orat. 42. de Pasch.—Chrysost. Hom. 75. de Pasch. [2] Pagi. Crit. in Baron. an 370. [3] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 53. [4] Conc. Matiscon. ii. can. 2. Conc. Trull. can. 66. [5] August. Serm. de Temp. 160, 162, 163, 164.

between Easter and Whitsuntide; and sometimes the particular day for commemorating the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles.[1] The whole fifty days were celebrated as a continuous festival; and during this period it was customary to read and expound the Acts of the Apostles.[2] All fasting, and also kneeling at prayers during this season, was prohibited;[3] and also all public games and stage plays were forbidden by the emperor Theodosius junior, but not law proceedings or secular labour, except upon the Sundays included in the period.

§ 267. *Ascension Day.*

The next festival that may be noticed before coming to Whitsuntide, is that of our Saviour's ascension into heaven. Augustine derives its origin from apostolical institution, or the early and general agreement of the Church.[4] The Apostolical Constitutions reckon Ascension day among the great festivals of the Church, "because on this day our Saviour's economy on earth was completed." This day fell into the period of Pentecost in the larger sense of that word, but it was always particularly distinguished from the other days, by an appropriate discourse, &c.

§ 268. *Whitsunday.*

The conclusion of this great festival of fifty days was Whitsunday, sometimes called Pentecost, in the stricter sense of the word. It was kept as a special festival, in commemoration of the descent of the Holy Ghost; and was hence also called ***the day of the Holy Ghost.***[5] Some think it received the name of ***Whitsunday*** because of the spiritual light and wisdom shed upon the apostles; but perhaps also it owes the name to the fact of its being one of the great seasons of baptizing, which was also called illumination.

§ 269. *Festivals of the Martyrs.*

Thus far we have noticed the festivals celebrated throughout the whole Church in commemoration of particular periods of Christ's

---

[1] Tertull. de Idololat. cap. 14. de Bapt. c. 19. [2] Chrysost. Hom. 63. tom. v. p. 949. August. Tract. 6. in Joh. Hom. 83. de diversis. [3] Tertull. de Coron. cap. 3. Conc. Nice. can. 20. [4] August. Ep. 118 ad Januar. [5] Naz. Orat. 44. de Pentecost.

history. There were however other festivals instituted by the Church in honour of Apostles and Martyrs. The origin of these is carried by learned men as high as the second century.[1] They are frequently spoken of by Cyprian and Tertullian; but there is a much earlier mention of them in the epistle of the church of Smyrna relative of the martyrdom of Polycarp, about the year 168.[2]

The festivals of martyrs were commonly called their *Natalia* or *Birth-days*, because they were the days of their birth into the eternal glories of heaven.[3]

These festivals were commonly celebrated over the graves or monuments of the martrys, which were usually without the walls of cities, in large vaults under ground. Here, in the earliest times, the Christians also used often to meet for freedom and security in their common worship. In after times churches were often built over these graves, and hence called *Martyria*, &c., as has been before mentioned.

These festivals at first were not general, but kept chiefly by those particular churches to which the martyrs respectively belonged, or where they were buried. And hence each church had its own particular calendar of martyrs.[4]

The Church had notaries whose special office it was to take account of the acts and sayings of martyrs at the time of their suffering, and to record the whole scene and story of their martyrdom. These accounts were very carefully preserved, and one part of the services on these festivals was the reading the story of the martyr whose day was celebrated.[5]

It was also customary to have an eulogy or panegyrical oration pronounced at these celebrations. In the works of Chrysostom, Basil, Augustine, and others, we have many such orations. The object of them was to cherish a reverence for the memory of the saint, and particularly to excite the people to the imitation of his holiness and virtue: but all notion of holding up the saints as objects of worship is expressly rejected.[6]

---

[1] Hospin. de Festis Chr. cap. iv. p. 14. Cave, Prim. Chr. p. 198. [2] Euseb. lib. iv. cap. 15. [3] Tertull. Scorp. contr. Gnost. cap. 15. Prudant. Hymn. xi. [4] Sozom. lib. v. cap. 3. Tertull. de cron. c. 13. [5] Conc. Carth. iii. can. 47. [6] Euseb. iv. cap. 15. August. de Vera. Rel. cap. 55. contr. Faust. lib. 21. c. 20.

The communion was always celebrated on these days, and in the service a more particular and solemn commemoration of the martyrs was made in the oblation or sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for them; to which were also joined prayers that they and all the faithful dead might attain a perfect consummation in bliss by a joyful resurrection.[1]

The night preceding these festivals was commonly observed as a vigil with psalmody and prayers.[2] It was usual also for the rich to give feasts of charity for the poor at the graves of martyrs on these occasions. These feasts were at the first managed with great sobriety, and designed solely for the comfort and refreshment of the poor. But at length they came to be abused to purposes of covetousness or inordinate indulgence, and were forbidden first by several bishops in their respective dioceses, and then by some councils.[3]

Besides the festivals of the apostolic and other martyrs, the Church also celebrated a festival in memory of the infants slain by order of Herod at the birth of Christ. It was called the festival of the *holy Innocents*.[4] The memory of some of the Old Testament martyrs was also kept by festivals, such as the Macabees. And finally it may be mentioned that as the number of these festivals of martyrs was very great, and no particular church could observe them all, therefore, while every church chiefly commemorated the days of her own martyrs, one solemn day was in addition set apart throughout the Church for the commemoration of all the martys. This was on a day not long after Whitsunday as we learn from Chrysostom.[5]

§ 270. *Some other Festivals of later date.*

Besides the above, there were at a later period several other festivals introduced into the Church, which were not however of such general observation as the foregoing. Among these may be mentioned the *Encænia*, or anniversary feasts kept in memory of the dedication of churches—the *natales Episcopatus*, or bishop's birth-

---

[1] Chrysost. Hom. 74. de Martyr. Tertul. de Cron. mil. cap. 3. Cypr. 37. al 12, 34, al 39. [2] Chrysost. Hom. 59. de Martyr. Sidon. lib. v. Ep. 17. [3] August. Confess. lib. vi. cap. 17. Ep. 64. ad Aurel. Conc. Carth. iii. can. 30. Con. Aurel. can. 12. [4] Origen. Hom. 3. de Diversis. August. de lib. Arbit. lib. iii. cap. 23. [5] Chrysost. Hom. 74. de Martyr.

days—festivals in commemoration of any great deliverance or special mercy vouchsafed by God to the Church—the annunciation—and candlemas. After the time of Constantine, festivals were exceedingly multiplied in the Church. A particular account of them may be found in the work of Hospinian *de Festis.*

CHAPTER SECOND.

OF THE FASTS OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

§ 271. *Of Lent—origin and time.*

The Fasts of the ancient Church were, like the festivals, some weekly and some only annual. Of the latter the fast of Lent was the most noted. It was called the *Quadragesima;* but whether because it was originally a fast of forty days, or only forty hours, has been disputed. Some maintain with the Romanists that apostolical institution established it as a fast of forty days; others that in its original apostolical institution it was only forty hours, or the time between the passion and resurrection, and that the extending it to forty days was of subsequent ecclesiastical appointment.[1]

There is some reason for supposing this was at first a fast of only forty hours, in the fact that this period corresponds to the time of the Saviour's being buried. Tertullian speaks of it as being of this length—calling it the Paschal fast; and Irenæus also calls it the fast of forty hours before Easter.[2] The latter of these writers speaks however of a variety of practice as to the length of the fast, yet as not affecting the peace and union of Christians. It appears that in the time of Tertullian and Irenæus, some churches observed other days besides the two before Easter—some more and some less; but though it was called the *quadragesimal* fast, and universally observed from the earliest times, the precise number of forty days was not introduced till after the time of Gregory the Great, or about the beginning of the seventh century. The variety of practice which

---

[1] Taylor, Duct. Dubitant. B. iii. cap. 4. Cave Prim. Christ, p. 182. Dallæ. de Jejun. lib. iii. cap. 9. [2] Tertull. de Jejun. cap. 2. cap. 13. Iren. ap. Euseb. lib. v. cap. 24.

prevailed in the early times renders it unlikely that the period of forty days fasting at Lent was of apostolical appointment; but rather that every church exercised its liberty in extending the time more or less beyond the two days. Some churches kept it three weeks, some six, and some seven. There were also different customs as to the kind and degree of abstinence; some abstaining from all animal food, others eating fish, and others nothing but dry bread; while some only fasted till three o'clock in the afternoon, and then eat any kind of food.[1]

All the Sundays that occurred during the period of Lent were excepted from the list of fast days, in the universal practice of the Church, and in the Oriental churches the Saturdays, except the one before Easter day were also reckoned as festival and not fast days. This partly explains the different length of the season of Lent—those churches that kept two days of the week as festivals naturally extended the season of Lent over a longer time than others; thus where Lent included seven weeks, or forty-nine days, the thirteen festival days being taken out, left only thirty-six for the fast. And it appears that for a considerable time thirty-six was the greatest number of fast days. Who first added Ash Wednesday and the other three days to the beginning of Lent, and thus completed the number to forty, is not known.

A question has been made whether this fast in any form was of apostolical institution. Cassian says expressly that in earliest times there was no Lent observed; but that it was appointed after the fervour and devotion of Christians began to decline, and as a useful means of recalling them from worldliness.[2] Whenever it is spoken of by ancient writers, such as Jerome, Basil, Cyril, &c., as a fast of divine institution, a careful examination of their language will show that they only mean that it is agreeable to the example of Christ, or of men approved in holy Scripture, and to be presumed agreeable to the divine will. Jerome speaks of it expressly as an apostolical appointment[3]—but at all events this could apply only to the two days before Easter, and not to the thirty-six, and at last forty days, to which it was extended. The history of the actual progress of the changes and extension of the season fully show this.

---

[1] Socrat. Hist. Eccl. lib. v. cap. 22.
[2] Cassian. Collat. xxi. cap. 30.
[3] Hieron. Ep. 54. ad. Marcell.

§ 272. *Reasons and Objects of Lent.*

Various reasons are assigned by the ancients for the institution of Lent. The first that may be mentioned is connected with the sorrow of the apostles, at the loss of their master, referring especially to the time the Lord lay in the grave. Another reason given was the declension of primitive piety—which led the Church to institute this lengthened and solemn fast to precede the older fast of the passion days, in order to revive the decayed fervour of piety. Thirdly, to afford a solemn season of preparation for communicating at Easter. This was thought especially important when the practice of frequent communion had so declined, as that men came to communion chiefly at Easter. And finally, respect was had to catechumens preparing for baptism, and penitents awaiting absolution at the coming Easter. These were required to observe the fast of Lent with great strictness.

§ 273. *How Lent was observed.*

Lent was observed by the Church at large as a proper season for fasting, repentance and mourning for sin, and as a suitable preparation for Easter. Yet discretion was allowed to every Christian as to the particular manner and degree of abstinence and mortification he should practice. Yet the general mode of keeping it was a total abstinence from all food until evening, every day except on Saturdays and Sundays.[1] Nor was it the practice of the pious to make up at night in luxurious indulgence for their abstinence during the day; but taking a light and simple supper, they bestowed what they saved on the poor.

In many of the larger churches religious service was had every day during the season—and on the Sabbath and Lord's day frequent communions. All public games and stage plays were forbidden; and by the imperial laws at a later period all corporal punishment was prohibited to be inflicted.

The celebration of festivals, birth-days, and marriages during Lent, was forbidden.[2] The *great week* before Easter, or passion

---

[1] Ambros. de Elia et Jejun. cap, 10. Chrysost. Hom. iv. vi. vii. in Gen.
[2] Conc. Laod. can. 51. 52.

week, was observed with peculiar strictness and solemnity; and many of the pious added instances of more special fasting and penitence, which were called *superpositiones*, or *additional fasts*—passing two or three days in perfect abstinence.[1] There are different sorts of fasting mentioned by the ancient writers—the first being called *Jejunium Noræ*, or fast till three o'clock in the afternoon; which was proper for Wednesdays or Fridays, the stationary days, or half-fast days. The second kind was the quadrigesimal fast, and kept till the evening. The third was the *jejunium superpositionis*, or superabundant fast, lasting till cock-crowing or day break. This was proper to passion week.

During the week before Easter the pious exercised themselves in special and abundant acts of kindness and charity towards their poor and distressed brethren. It was also a season of great rest and liberty to servants. By the imperial laws, after the state became Christian, all proceedings at law, as well civil as criminal, were suspended during passion week.

The *Thursday* of this week—as the day when the Lord was betrayed and seized—was observed with some peculiar customs. The Lord's supper was administered in the evening in some of the Latin Churches, in imitation of the last supper of Christ. Sometimes the communion was administered twice in the day, in the morning for such as could not keep the day fasting, and in the evening for such as had fasted till then.[2] On this day the *competentes*, or candidates for baptism publicly rehearsed the creed before the bishop or presbyters in church. It was specially customary for servants to receive the communion on this day. The more modern ritualists call this *Maundy Thursday*, or *Dies Mandati*, either because Christ gave his disciples the command and example to wash each other's feet, or because he instituted and commanded the sacrament of the Lord's supper.[3]

Passion Day, or *Good Friday*, was observed with peculiar solemnity. Besides the public worship appropriate to the day, it was a season peculiarly appropriated to reconciling penitents, and grant-

---

[1] Epiphan. Epit. Fid. 23. Tertull. de Jejun. cap. 14. [2] Conc. Carth. iii. can. 29. August. Ep. 118. ad Januar. [3] Sparrow, Rationale. p. 135. Lestrange, Alliance of Dio. Off. p. 142.

ing them absolution. A general absolution was likewise proclaimed to all people observing the day with fasting, prayer, and true contrition.

The *Saturday* of Passion week was commonly called the *Great Sabbath*, and was distinguished by some peculiarities of observance. Throughout the Eastern and some of the Western churches, it was the only Saturday of the year observed as a fast—all the other Saturdays even in Lent being kept as festivals. It was sometimes joined with the preceding day, and both together were kept as one continued fast of superposition. Thus we find it ordered in the Constitutions "let as many as are able fast the Friday and Saturday throughout, eating nothing till the cock-crowing in the morning: but if any cannot join both days together in one continued fast, let him however keep the Sabbath (Saturday) a fast: for the Lord speaking of himself, said, 'When the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, in those days shall they fast.'"[1] Hence this day was kept as a fast over the whole Church until cock-crowing on the morning of the resurrection; and the night was spent as a vigil or pernoctation, religious assemblies being held and divine services performed.[2] It was a night specially set apart also for baptizing catechumens.

§ 274. *The Fasts of the Four Seasons.*

These were anniversary fasting days called *Jejunia quatuor temporum*, or fasts of the four seasons—spring, summer, autumn, and winter; and were observed in March, June, September, and December. These were designed at first to beg a blessing upon the several seasons of the year, and to exercise and purify the body and soul at these stated periods of the year.

Besides these, there was for several ages a fast observed previous to Epiphany, called the Epiphany fast: and in some churches monthly fasts, except in the month of July and August.[3]

After a time the fasts of the four seasons came to be held also as the Ember weeks or ordination fasts. This however did not take place till many ages.—The Rogation fast, or the three days immediately before Ascension day, did not come to be observed till the middle of the fifth century; and never was a rule of the Church at large.

---

[1] Const. Apost. lib. v. cap. 18. [2] Ibid. cap. 19. [3] Conc. Eliber. can 23. Conc. Turon. ii. can. 18.

§ 274. *The Weekly fasts of Wednesdays and Fridays.*

These were called stationary days—half-fasts—fasts of the fourth and sixth days. They are as ancient as Clemens Alexandrinus and Tertullian, by whom they are expressly mentioned, as also by Origen.[1] Their observance had reference to the day on which the Lord was betrayed, and to that in which he suffered.[2] They differed however from the Lent fast, in not being kept with such strictness, the fasting and religious services being held only till three o'clock in the afternoon.

CHAPTER THIRD.

OF THE MARRIAGE RITES OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

§ 275. *Opinions of some ancient Heretics concerning marriage.*

Before describing the practice of the Church respecting marriage, and the rites and usages connected with its celebration, it may be proper to notice the opinions of various heretical sects, who under pretence of greater purity, condemned marriage as unlawful, or held to a community of wives. This latter doctrine was first taught by Simon Magus, who grounded his impurities upon the grossest Antinomian opinions.[3] The Nicolaitans, (supposed to be the same sect condemned in Revelations, ii. 20,) followed his doctrines, condemning marriage and giving free allowance to impurity. There were other sects, as the Adamites, Carpocratians, and Gnostics, who taught and practiced the same corruptions—not only giving allowance to uncleanness, but introducing licentious indulgences into their religious mysteries and rites. Hence it came, that the heathen charged upon Christians in general the impurities practised by these corrupt and heretical sects.

But besides the sects above named, who connected the denial of marriage either with the doctrine of a community of women, or with

---

[1] Clem. Alex. Strom. 7. Tertull. de Jejun. cap. 14. Origen. Hom. 10. in Levit. [2] Basil. Ep. 289. Hieron. in Galet. 4. &c. [3] Au ust. de Hær. cap. 1. Epiphan. Hær. i. Iren. lib. i. cap. 20.

a free allowance of licentious intercourse,—there were others who simply denied the lawfulness of marriage, and would have all men abstain from it and from women, as necessary to salvation. This was the doctrine of Tatian, and his disciples the *Encratites;* also of those calling themselves the *Apostolici* or *Apotactici*, to signify that they imitated the apostles and renounced the world more than other men. These sects considered marriage as fornication—and would not receive into their communion any married persons.[1] The same opinions were maintained by the *Manichees*, the *Severians*, the *Archontici*, the *Hieracians*, and the *Eustathians*—who are spoken of by Clemens Alexandrinus, by Epiphanius, and by Augustine.[2]

Against these heretical doctrines the council of Gangra published several canons.[3] The Church also had a contest with the Montanists and Novatians, who forbad second marriages. From Epiphanius and the canons of the great council of Nice, we learn the opinion of these heretics, and that the general sense of the Catholic Church was against them.[4]

§ 277. *Of the just impediments to marriage held in the Catholic Church.*

From this notice of the views of certain heretics derogatory to marriage, we may pass to speak of what restraints the Church herself laid upon particular persons.—Of this sort was the rule forbidding Christians to marry with heathens or infidels, because of the scandal or danger attending it. This rule was grounded upon the Apostolic injunction, i Cor. vii. 39. Abundant citations might be made from the early writers showing the sense of the Church on this point.[5] The canons of various early councils are express in forbidding Christians to marry except "in the Lord;" some of them simply prohibiting it, and others annexing the punishment of suspension or excommunication in case of violation.[6] These canons were

---

[1] Iren. lib. i. cap. 30. Epiphan. Hær cap. 47. August. de Hær. cap. 25. cap. 40. [2] August. de Hær. cap. 46. Epiphan. Hær. 45. Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. cap. 9. [3] Conc. Gangr. in Præf. [4] Epiphan. Hær. 48, 59. Conc. Nic. can. 8. [5] Cypr. Testimon. lib. iii. cap. 62. de Lapsis. p. 123. Tertull. de. Coron. cap. 13. Hieron. Ep 11. ad. Gerontiam. &c. [6] Conc. Laod. can. 10. can. 31. Conc. Carth. iii. can. 12. Conc. Agath. can. 67. Conc. Chalc. can. 14. Conc. Arelat. i. can. ii. Conc. Eliber. can. 15. 16. 17.

confirmed by the civil codes after the establishment of Christianity, some laws making such forbidden marriages capitally punishable. And to prevent such marriages, all Christians were required to acquaint the Church with their intentions of marrying, so that if any obstacle appeared she might interpose her influence or authority.[1]

Another rule of the Church prohibited the marriage of persons too nearly allied by consanguinity or affinity—as being incestuous. The council of Agde has this canon concerning such marriages: "We allow no pardon, unless the offending parties cure the adultery by separation from each other. We reckon incestuous persons unworthy of any name of marriage, and dreadful to be named. For they are such as these: if any one pollutes his brother's relict; if any one takes to wife his own sister; if any one marries his stepmother; if any one joins himself to his cousin-german; if a man marries any one nearly allied to him by consanguinity, or one whom his near kinsman had married before; if any one marries the relict or daughter of his uncle by the mother's side, or the daughter of his uncle by his father's side, or his daughter-in-law, &c.[2] It may be remarked upon this canon, that the marriage of cousins though forbidden by it, was not forbidden by the Church at an earlier period. But in general, whatever at any time was accounted an incestuous marriage, was always prohibited, and punished by the censures of the Church, and the marriage dissolved.

Another rule was that children under age were not to marry without the consent of their parents, guardians, or next relatives. This was strongly forbidden by the civil laws, and the Church was very careful not to incur any scandal or blame by countenancing the violation of them.[3]—Slaves in like manner were not to marry without the consent of their masters.—Another thing requisite to a lawful marriage was some equality of rank or condition; and hence persons of superior station were not to marry slaves. This was a strict enactment of the civil code, and as such was respected by the Church. The same may also be said of the civil law, forbidding judges of provinces to marry any woman within their jurisdiction during their year of office—and also forbidding widows to marry

---

[1] Ignat. Ep. ad Polycarp. v. Tertull. ad Uxor. lib. ii. cap. 2. [2] Conc. Agathen. can. 30. [3] Tertull. ad Uxor. cap. 9. August. Ep. 233.

again before the expiration of a year from the death of their husbands. If a woman's husband went abroad and continued absent from her, she was not allowed to marry again till certified of his death. Otherwise she was reputed guilty of adultery. In case the first husband appeared again, he might claim his wife.[1] The civil law however, allowed a soldier's wife to marry again after waiting four years.

The rule against the marriage of spiritual relations, that is, of sponsors and god-children, was not one of earliest antiquity; but came in at the time of Justinian.

The rules of the Church against marrying again after unlawful divorce, have been mentioned in a former part of this work: it remains only to consider the question concerning marrying again after a lawful divorce. Upon this point the ancients were divided. Origen was against it, yet he says there were some bishops who permitted it.[2] Constantine made a law allowing a man, for three crimes, adultery, sorcery, and pandery, to put away his wife and marry another.[3] Epiphanius gives it as the sense of the Church in his time, that the clergy were forbidden to marry a second wife even after the death of the first; but that laymen might not only marry in such a case, but also after lawful divorce even though the first wife might be still living.[4] Augustine thought this not right, but that the sense of Scripture upon the point was not so clear, as that it should subject to excommunication. So the council of Arles.[5] But the council of Eliberis goes further, and debars women thus marrying, in certain cases, from the communion, till the other party be dead.[6] This was not however, the general rule.

§ 278. *Sponsalia or Espousals preceding marriage.*

When persons, not hindered by any lawful impediment, were disposed to be married, there were certain preliminaries appointed by custom or law, to be gone through previous to a regular marriage. This was the *sponsalia*, or betrothing, and was distinct from marriage. It consisted chiefly in a mutual agreement or contract of mar-

---

[1] Basil. can. 31. 36. Conc. Trull. can. 93. [2] Orig. Hom. vii. in Mat. [3] Cod. Theod. lib. iii. tit. xvi. de Repud. leg. 1. [4] Epiphan. Hær. 59. [5] Aug. de Fide et Oper. cap. 19. Conc. Arelat. i. can. 10. [6] Conc. Eliber. can. 11.

riage, to be performed within a certain time. This contract was confirmed by certain gifts, called *arræ et arrabones*, the earnest of marriage; also by a ring, a kiss, a dowry or writing of dowry, with a sufficient number of witnesses attesting the contract. The violation of such a contract incurred great penalties by the civil law, and also oftentimes the highest censures of the Church.

To these espousals the free consent of the parties was necessary, and great care was taken that no force or constraint should influence to such contracts. The gifts, *sponsalitial donationes, espousal gifts,* were commonly given by the men, and sometimes, (though seldom) by the women. In case of the death of either party before marriage, these gifts reverted to the surviving party, or their legal successors—though some difference of practice prevailed in case of the man surviving, provided he had confirmed the donation by the ceremony of a solemn kiss; in which case it was divided between the survivor and the heirs of the deceased. These donations were to be recorded in the public acts and registers.

Though the violation of such contracts was a high offence and severely punished, yet it was not absolutely necessary that such contracts should always precede a regular marriage. It is true that at a later period such preliminary ceremonies were by law required in regard to certain persons of high dignities and offices. But as to others, they might, without any such previous formalities, go to a church, with witnesses, and either with or without written instruments of dowry, according to the condition of the parties, be legally married by the clergy.

§ 279. *Manner of solemnizing marriage.*

The question by whom a marriage might properly be solemnized first occurs, and the answer varies according to certain differences of circumstances. Marriages between Christians during the early ages of the Church were performed by the ministers of the Church. But in the case of Christians marrying Jews or heathen, &c.,—as such marriages were forbidden by the Church, the ministers would not of course solemnize them: yet while the civil laws permitted them, the Church could not annul them, but only punish her own members by ecclesiastical discipline. But where the civil laws forbid and annulled marriages, that were also against the rules of the

Church, the latter could then disannul them. And lastly, the Church did not always regard a marriage as null, which might be so regarded by the civil laws.

As to the person solemnizing marriage, it may be said that for the first three centuries, the rule and practice of the Church required the benediction of a minister. But after Christianity became established, and yet the State left other ways of rendering a marriage valid in law, besides its being celebrated by a clergyman, the rule and practice of the earlier times came to be neglected. In the eighth and ninth centuries, an attempt was made by some of the more zealous emperors, to revive the primitive rule,—and the Romish church has ever since been strict and uniform in the observation of it.

Among the ceremonies of marriage, may be mentioned the rite of joining the right hands of the parties together.[1] Ambrose also mentions the custom of veiling as in use;[2] and Tertullian mentions the same in connection with that of joining hands and a solemn kiss.[3]

When the office of benediction by the priest was over, the bride and bridegroom were commonly crowned with garlands—though the way in which this is mentioned by some writers seems to indicate that it was a peculiar ceremony performed to distinguish such as had before lived in purity from such as had not.[4] This crowning the new married couple with garlands was a custom of the heathens, and as being innocent in itself was not repudiated by Christians.[5]

There was another custom, not however connected with the religious celebration of marriage, yet often practiced, that of carrying home the bride in pomp to her husband's house. This was in some places necessary to the legal completion of marriage. This was a part of the innocent festivities of a wedding not reckoned improper by the Church. The same may be said likewise of the nuptial feast, and *epithalamium* or nuptial hymen; but the Church condemned all scurrilous and immodest practices, and all intemperate and immoderate revellings, as may be seen from the canons of the council of Laodicea, and from various ancient writers.[6]

---

[1] Greg. Naz. Ep. 57. [2] Ambros. Ep. 70. [3] Tertull. de Veland. cap. 11. [4] Chrysost. Hom. 9. in 1 Tim. [5] Tertull. de Coron. cap. 13. [6] Conc. Load. can. 53. Chrysost. Hom. 48. in Genes. Hom. 56. in Genes.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

OF THE FUNERAL RITES OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

§ 280. *Of Cemeteries or Burying-places.*

That the early Christians had places peculiar to themselves for burying their dead, is evident from their practice of assembling in times of persecution at the graves of their martyrs to celebrate divine service. These were called κοιμητήρια, *cemeteria*, *dormitories*, or *sleeping places*—death being spoken of by them, as also in the New Testament, as a sleep. These were also called *cryptæ*, as being sometimes vaults under ground; also *areæ sepultararum*. Upon these graves of martyrs, churches were in after times frequently built, as has been mentioned; but for the three first centuries, the custom did not exist of burying their dead in the churches, or even in the cities. The burying of the dead within the walls of cities was contrary to the civil laws at that period, and the Christians were careful of obedience to all civil laws not interfering with their Christian duty. During all this period, the custom was to bury the dead in tombs erected at the public expense upon the roads without the cities, or in vaults and catacombs under ground in the fields.[1] And for several ages, even after the emperors became Christian, the same laws and customs continued. Theodosius expressly forbad all burying in cities and in churches,[2] of which Chrysostom makes mention.[3]

Indeed the first thing that led to the custom of burying in the churches, was the building of churches over the graves of martyrs without the cities, in the fourth century. From thence it came to pass that the ashes or remains of martyrs were transferred and deposited in churches built to their memory within the cities, and for a time no other than the remains of such martyrs were permitted to be placed in churches. The next step was the permitting of the bodies of kings and emperors to be buried within the *atrium* or outer porch of the churches. In the seventh century this per-

---

[1] Chrysost. Hom. 17. t. 6. p. 184. Tertull. de Test. aninxæ. cap. 4. [2] Cod. Theod. lib. ix. tit. 17. [3] Chrysost. Hom. 37. al 74. in Mat.

mission was extended to the people, and the bodies of kings, bishops, founders of churches, and other eminent persons, were allowed to be buried in the churches. And finally, it came to be left with the bishops and presbyters to permit burials within the churches at their discretion.

§ 281. *Manner and Time of Burial.*

There is no trace in the early times of the Church, of the custom of consecrating burial places. This practice is first mentioned in the sixth century by Gregory of Tours. Yet these places were reckoned sacred, as well among the heathen as Christians, and the violation of them in any way was deemed a great sacrilege.

Hence they were considered as places of great security not only for the dead, but for ornaments placed about them, or treasures buried with them. Various ways of adorning the graves were in use—as by pillars, statues, &c.; but this would not be much practised among the early Christians, exposed, as they and the graves of their dead were, to indignity. And even at a later period, the laying out of much expense in this way, was discountenanced by the pious, as not consistent with the duty of charity to the poor.[1]

The practice of Christians differed also from the heathen in respect to the manner of burying. They never burned the bodies of the dead, but placed them whole in the ground. In some cases they resorted to embalming in order to preserve the body, when some occasion required.[2] The custom of embalming the dead for burial, was much more common among Christians than among the heathen. Tertullian indeed seems to intimate that it was the general practice of Christians.[3] This might have been derived from the customs of the Jews, and particularly from the fact of the Saviour's being embalmed, or from the circumstance, before adverted to, of the burial places being also frequently places of religious assembly.

The heathen usually performed their funeral obsequies by night; but the Christians, whenever they could with safety, in the times of persecution—and afterwards always, chose the day time; though

---

1 Basil. Hom. in Divites. Tertull. Apol. cap. 42.

2 Minuc. p. 32. 101. Tertull. de Anima. cap. 51.

it was a common practice to have lighted candles or torches at their funerals, as on other occasions of religious celebration.[1]

§ 282. *Preparing the body for funeral.*

No act of charity is more magnified by ancient writers than that of burying the dead; and in times of persecution and of pestilence, it was often done at the hazard of life. Eutychianus is celebrated in the Roman martyrology for having buried three hundred and forty-two martyrs with his own hands.[2] Dionysius of Alexandria gives a remarkable account of the pious and courageous charity of Christians during a terrible plague in Egypt, in which they watched the sick while alive, prepared their bodies for burial when they died, and carried them to the grave and interred them with their own hands, although in most such cases it was sure to be soon their turn, taking the infection from the sick and dead whom they attended, to be struck down and in need of the same offices.[3]

The manner of preparing the body for funeral consisted in first closing the eyes and mouth—as a thing agreeable to nature and decency. Then the body was laid out and washed with water, and the limbs properly composed; after which it was dressed and adorned in robes proper for the funeral.[4] Then it was laid in the coffin, and watched until the time of the funeral. The coffins were more or less costly and adorned, according to the condition and circumstances of the deceased and his relatives. The bodies were kept from two to seven days—sometimes in the houses, and sometimes in the church, attended by the watchers. It was very common to sing psalms and hymns during the night, while watching the dead. Thus Augustine speaks of his mother's death, and says that "Euodius took the psalter and began to sing a psalm, and the whole family answered alternately: 'I will sing of mercy and of judgment: unto thee, O Lord, will I sing.'"[5]

---

[1] Chrysost. Hom. 4. in Heb. Greg. Naz. Orat. 10. in. Cæsarium. Hieron. contr. Vigilant. cap. 3. [2] Pontifical. Vit. Eutych. [3] Dionys. ap. Euseb. lib. vii. cap. 22. [4] Tertull. Apol. cap. 42. Durant. de Ritibus. lib. i. cap. 23. Euseb. lib. vii. cap. 16. Hieron. Ep. 49. ad. Innocent. [5] August. Confess. lib. ix. cap. 12.

§ 283. *Funeral ceremonies.*

Being thus prepared, when the time for burial had come, the body was borne to the grave, either by the next relations, or, when particular honour was designed to the dead, by persons of quality. But in the case of the poor, and destitute of relatives, or of those who died of infectious diseases, this office was performed by charitable persons. In the earliest times of the Church there were great multitudes dependent upon the charity of their brethren for the last offices; and the duty of performing them was held very binding and sacred. The poor were buried at the common expense of the Church, and in some great churches there were particular orders of men, under the names of *Copiatæ* and *Parabolani*, of whom mention has been made; whose duty it was to attend upon the poor, sick and dying, dig their graves and perform all the offices necessary for their decent funeral.

When the times of persecution ceased, so as to allow it, the dead were carried to their graves by the Christians in procession, chanting solemn hymns—concerning which particular directions are given in the Apostolical Constitutions.[1] Chrysostom also mentions what particular psalms were used as well as the reason of them. "For our psalmody, and prayers, and solemn meeting of fathers, and such a multitude of brethren, is not that thou shouldst weep and lament, and be angry at God; but give him thanks for taking a deceased brother to himself."[2] Jerome also speaks of psalmody as one of the chief parts of the funeral solemnities.[3]

The heathen custom of crowning the coffin with garlands, seems not to have been adopted by the Christians, being conceived to have in its origin and significance something idolatrous. They did not however, scruple to carry lights before the dead in their processions.

Funeral orations were commonly pronounced at the grave, if there was any thing remarkable or eminent in the character or station of the deceased, or furnishing a salutary example to the living.

But whether such orations were delivered, or not, the usual order

---

[1] Const. Apost. lib. vi. cap. 30. [2] Chrysost. Hom. 4 in Hebr. [3] Hieron, Epitaph. Paulac. Ep. 27.

of daily public service was had:—if the burial took place in the morning, the morning service and communion was celebrated; if in the evening, the psalmody and prayers only. Selections of Scripture, containing reference to the resurrection were read by the deacon; and after the catechumens were dismissed, the commemorative prayers for all the faithful dead were read. Then the bishop offered a prayer specially referring to the deceased person, and committed him to the earth.

In the Apostolical Constitutions[1] is a form of prayers for the funeral service, which may be quoted as showing that they did not proceed in the least degree upon the Romish doctrine of purgatory.

First the deacon says:

"Let us pray for our brethren who are at rest in Christ; that the merciful God who hath taken the soul of this our brother, would forgive him all his sin voluntary and involuntary, and of his great mercy and good will place him in the regions of the just, that are at rest in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with all those who have pleased God, and done his will from the beginning of the world, in the place whence sorrow, and grief, and mourning are fled away."

After this the bishop prays in these words:

"O thou immortal and everlasting God, from whom every thing whether mortal or immortal has its being; who hast made man a rational creature, and inhabitant of the world, mortal in his constitution, but promised him a resurrection from the dead; who didst preserve Enoch and Elias from tasting death: O God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who art not the God of the dead, but of the living; because the souls of all live to thee, and the spirits of just men are in thy hand, whom torment cannot touch: look down now upon this thy servant, whom thou hast chosen and received to another state; pardon him whatsoever he has sinned willingly or unwillingly against thee; grant him favourable angels, and place him in the bosom of patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and all those who have pleased thee from the beginning of the world, where there is no sorrow, grief, or trouble, but a place of rest for the godly, a land of quietness for the upright, and all those who therein see the glory of thy

[1] Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 41.

Christ: by whom all glory, honour, adoration, thanksgiving, and worship be to thee, through the Holy Ghost, forever. *Amen.*"

Then the bishop prayed again for the people there present:

"Lord save thy people, and bless thine inheritance, whom thou hast purchased with the precious blood of thy Christ; feed them under thy right hand, protect them under thy wings, grant that they may fight the good fight, and may finish their course, and keep the faith, immutable, unblamable, unreproachable, through our Lord Jesus Christ, thy beloved Son; to whom with thee and the Holy Ghost be all glory, honour, and adoration, world without end. *Amen.*"

To the solemnities of the funeral service were commonly added alms giving and offices of charity to the poor and distressed.[1] These were sometimes repeated yearly upon the anniversaries of commemorating the dead. At such times also it was a custom to make a feast for the entertainment of the clergy and people, and especially of the poor. But this often led to abuses of riot and intemperance, which are condemned by ancient writers as being no better than the *parentalia*, or funeral feasts for parents of the heathen.

Decent tokens and expressions of sorrow for the loss of friends were not discountenanced by the Church, but she sharply condemned the heathen custom of hearing *præficæ* or hired mourning women, to regulate artificially the lamentations, and expressions of sorrow—as howling, tearing the hair, &c.

The custom of strewing flowers upon the graves of the dead was reckoned innocent, and retained by Christians; also that of wearings a mourning habit for some time.

These are the principal things to be noticed respecting the funeral rites of the ancients. Great importance was attached to them in the feeling of Christians, and to be deprived of them was held a great calamity. It was the privilege of all the faithful, dying in the peace and communion of the Church. All excommunicants continuing and dying obstinate—all guilty of suicide—all catechumens wilfully neglecting baptism, were denied the rites of Christian burial.

---

[1] Chrysost. Hom. 40. in 1 Cor.

APPENDIX.

I.

THE PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN REGARD TO LAY-BAPTISM.

[From Bingham's Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism. Chap. III. Sect. 5.]

We may observe some difference between the directions given in the Liturgy, as it stood in the time of King Edward and Queen Elizabeth, and those of the Liturgy in the time of King James, which received some alteration after the conference at Hampton-Court. In the old Liturgy, the rubric of private baptism ran in these words,[1] "First let them that be present call upon God for his Grace, and say the Lord's Prayer, if the time will suffer: and then one of them shall name the child and dip him in the water, or pour water upon him, saying these words, I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." This rubric was couched in such general terms, without restraining private baptism to a minister, that hence it is certain in fact, occasion was taken frequently both by laymen and women to baptize children privately, without a public minister: whence arose two questions among the learned men of those days: 1. Whether such baptisms were legally performed, and according to the intent and rules of the Church? And, 2. If they were illegal and against rule, whether they were also wholly null and invalid, and, as such, to be repeated again? Upon the first point learned men were a little divided; some were of opinion, that the words of the rubric did no ways authorise lay persons, men or women, to baptize in private; but by private baptism is only meant baptism administered in a private house, not publicly in a church, and this to be given only by the minister, and not by any

[1] Hamon l'Estrange Alliannce of Div. Offices, c. viii. p. 223.

private person. This was the sense of Archbishop Whitgift, as is evident both from his answer to the Admonition, and his Defence of it against Cartwright. His words are these:[1] "The Book of Common-Prayer doth call it private baptism, in respect of the place, which is a private house, and not in respect of the minister. For even in necessity the curate may be sent for, or some other minister that may sooner be come by." See also the Conference at Hampton-Court. Others think the Church, though she did not approve of this kind of baptism, yet intended to permit and tolerate it for a time, till men's prejudices and wrong notions, settled in them by long custom, might gently wear off without any prejudice to the Reformation. So Archbishop Abbot gives his opinion of this rubric: "As Moses," says he,[2] "for a time suffered the Israelites, for the hardness of their hearts, to give a bill of divorce in lesser causes; so for the weakness of men, and hardness of some, laymen were suffered to baptize. Which I take to have been the true reason, why any mention was made of private baptism, by those who first abolished superstition, and compiled the Common-Prayer-Book in this kingdom: not that they thought baptism given by a layman was altogether legitimate and right; but they were not willing to deter the ignorant and unlearned people from the true religion at the first dawning of the Reformation, by pressing too severely upon them, a thing which was so directly contrary to the opinion which they had for many years imbibed. But a toleration and permission does not conclude that to be right and just, which is only tolerated for a time." This difference in men's opinions continued to the time of the Hampton-Court Conference: for there the several disputants expressed their minds variously upon it. Archbishop Whitgift was still of the same mind,[3]

---

[1] Whitgift Defen. of the Answ. to the Admon. Tract. ix. p. 504. [2] Abbot. Prælect. ii. de Baptismo. p. 97. Præ infirmitate hominum, aut duritia aliquorum, laicos mysteriis imbuere passi sunt. Quod pro certo existimo in causa fuisse, cur in regno olim nostro, qui abolita superstitione, preces nostras et liturgiam in certam formam librumque redegerunt, privati baptismi mentionem subintulerunt; non quod baptismum datum per laicos, potissimum autem per fœminas, legitimum esse arbitrati fuissent; sed ne primis Evangelii revocandi auspiciis, indoctam et insciam multitudinem a vera pietate deterrerent, illud ingerendo, quod imbibitæ per multos annos opinioni expresse adeo adversaretur. Sed toleratio et permissio, fas et justum esse, quod ad tempus toleratur, non concludit. [3] Conferen. at Hampton-Court, p. 14.

"that the administration of baptism by women and lay-persons was not allowed in the practice of the Church, but inquired of by bishops in their visitations, and censured; neither do the words in the book infer any such meaning." But the King excepted to this, and urged the words of the Book, that they could not but intend a permission and suffering of women and private persons to baptize. The Bishop of Worcester, Babington, said, "that the words were doubtful, and might be pressed to that meaning; but yet it seemed by the contrary practice of our Church, censuring women in this case, that the compilers of the Book did not so intend them, and yet propounded them ambiguously, because otherwise, perhaps, the Book would not have then passed in parliament." Whereunto Bancroft, the Bishop of London, replied, "that those learned and reverend men, who framed the Book of Common-Prayer, intended not by ambiguous terms to deceive any, but did indeed by those words intend a permission of private persons to baptize in case of necessity, whereof their letters were witnesses;" some parts whereof he then read, and withal declared, "that the same was agreeable to the practice of the primitive Church."

Bilson,[1] the bishop of Winchester, spake also very learnedly and earnestly in that point, affirming, "that the denying of private persons in cases of necessity to baptize, were to cross all antiquity, seeing that it had been the ancient and common practice of the Church, when ministers at such times could not be got; and that it was also a rule agreed upon by divines, that the minister is not of the essence of the sacrament." To which his majesty answered, "though he be not of the essence of the sacrament, yet he is of the essence of the right and lawful ministry of the sacrament;" taking for his ground, the commission of Christ to his disciples, Matt. xxviii. 20. "Go, preach and baptize."

Dr. Willet, who wrote his Controversies whilst the old rubric was in force, was also of Archbishop Whitgift's opinion,[2] "that neither laymen of what calling soever, nor yet midwives, or any other women, ought to be suffered in a well-reformed Church to baptize infants; neither are they authorized so to do amongst us."

This difference there was then in men's opinions concerning the

[1] Conferen. at Hampton-Court, p. 18. [2] Willet Synopsis Papismi, p. 490.

sense of the rubric of our church, as it then stood: but yet they all agreed upon the second point, that whether such baptisms were according to rule or against rule, permitted or not permitted, yet they were not absolutely null and void, or as such to be repeated by a lawful minister in order to obtain salvation. Archbishop Whitgift pleads as strongly as any man for the validity of such baptisms, though he did not believe them to be done according to any rule, or so much as permission of the Church. In one place[1] he argues thus against Cartwright, who disliked as well deacons' as women's baptizing: "We read in the eighth of the Acts, that Phillip, a deacon, did baptize: we read also that Moses's wife did circumcise. But where doth this Church of England allow any woman to baptize, or deacon to celebrate the Lord's Supper? and if it did, the dignity of the sacraments do not depend upon the man, be he a minister or not minister, be he good or evil. Let every one take heed that they do not usurp that authority whereunto they be not called." In another place[2] speaking again of Zipporah's circumcision, he says, "Moses at this time was extremely sick, and therefore could not execute that office himself." And in the Geveva Bible there is this note: "that it was extraordinary, for Moses was sore sick, and God even then required it. Zipporah therefore did circumcise in a point of extremity, and not wilfully or of purpose: and that circumcision was a true circumcision, though it were not done ordinarily: even so baptism is true baptism, though it be sometimes ministered by such as are not ordinary ministers." A little after[3] he pleads the universal practice of all churches, ancient and modern: "although," says, he "divers, both old and new, do not allow that laymen should be suffered to baptize; yet there is none of them, such only excepted as err in rebaptization, that think the being of the sacrament so to depend upon the minister, that it is no sacrament, if it be not celebrated by a minister." Here he alleges Tertullian, Ambrose, Jerom, Austin, Zuinglius, and Calvin himself. And then concludes, that if his adversary's doctrine were true, there had need be some general rebaptization throughout all Christendom, as well of men as of children, for certain it is, that that sacrament hath been

---

[1] Whitgift Defen. of the Answer to the Admonit. Tract. ix. p. 515. [2] Ibid. p. 517. [3] Ibid. p. 518.

ministered to many, by such as be in no degree of the ministry. He urges further[1] the famous example of Athanasius, and the Jew that was baptized in sand instead of water, by a layman. This latter was re-baptized, but not the former. "This argueth," says he, "that the Church then made no doubt in respect of the persons that ministered this baptism, but only because there lacked water. And certainly if the being of the sacrament depended upon man in any respect, we were but in a miserable case: for we should be always in doubt, whether we were rightly baptized or no. But it is most true, that the force and strength of the sacrament is not in the man, be he minister or not minister, be he good or evil, but in God himself, in his Spirit, in his free and effectual operation. This I speak not to bring confusion into the Church? for, as I said before, let men take heed that they usurp not an office, whereunto they be not called, for God will call them to an account for so doing, but to teach a truth, to take a yoke of doubtfulness from men's consciences, and to resist an error not much differing from Donatism and Anabaptism." He finally illustrates this matter from the example of preaching:[2] "He that speaketh the words of Scripture, and doth interpret them, preacheth, though he be not thereunto called: and it is the true word of God he preacheth, if he truly interpret; but he intrudeth himself into a vocation whereunto he is not called, and therefore offendeth God: but that doth derogate nothing from the word preached. The same reason is of the administration of the sacraments: for, as the word of God is the word of God, by whomsoever it be preached, minister or other, so is the sacrament of baptism true baptism by whomsoever it be celebrated: the usurper of the office hath to answer for this intrusion, but the sacrament is not thereby defiled." And a little after,[3] "I go not about to prove that women may baptize, only I withstand this error, that the substance and being of the sacraments dependeth upon the man in any respect. I say, that baptism ministered by women is true baptism, though it be not lawful for women to baptize; as the baptism also ministered by heretics is true baptism, though they be usurpers of the office. And I further say, that if the baptism administered by heretical ministers,

[1] Whitgift Defen. of the Answer to the Admonit. Tract. xi. p. 519. [2] Ibid. p. 520. [3] Ibid. p. 521.

which be no members of the Church, be notwithstanding good and effectual, I see no cause why it should not be so rather, if it be ministered by laymen which are members and parts of the Church." Mr. Hooker had occasion to answer Cartwright upon the same subject, and he does it almost as copiously as the archbishop, but I shall only transcribe one passage, wherewith he concludes his discourse upon it. "Last of all," says he,[1] "whereas general and full consent of the Godly-learned in all ages doth make for validity of baptism, yea, albeit administered in private, and even by women: which kind of baptism, in case of necessity, divers Reformed churches do both allow and defend; some others, which do not defend, tolerate; few, in comparison, and they without any just cause, do utterly disannul and annihilate: surely, howsoever through defect on either side, the sacrament may be without fruit, as well in some cases to him that receiveth, as to him which giveth it, yet no disability of either party can so far make it frustrate and without effect, as to deprive it of the very nature of true baptism, having all things else which the ordinance of Christ requireth." Whereupon we may consequently infer, that the administration of this sacrament by private persons, be it lawful or unlawful, appeareth not as yet to be merely void. Archbishop Abbot, in his Theological Lecture before the University of Oxford, largely maintains the same opinion,[2] that such baptisms, though irregularly given, are not to be repeated. His reasons are, 1st. Because the person of the minister is not of the essence or being of the sacrament, but only of the well-being. The form of the sacrament is baptizing in water in the name of the Trinity. Therefore it is most agreeable to the rules of piety, to have it done only by a minister; but yet it is done, though it be done by another. 2d. He argues from the axiom of the law, which is, "*Multa fieri non debent, quæ tamen facta valent; many things ought not to be done, which yet are valid when they are done.*" As the marriage of children against the consent of their parents, which is a thing that ought not to be done, but yet is valid when it is done. 3d. He argues from the general and perpetual consent and practice of the Church. 4th. From the sense and practice of the church of England,

[1] Hooker Eccles. Polit. lib. v. n. lxii. p. 246. [2] Abbot. Prælect. ii. de Bapt. p. 99. Ministrantis personam non de esse sacramenti, sed de bene esse judicarunt. Pie igitur fit, si minister tangat solus; at fit etiam si tangat alius.

which, for a time, tolerated such baptisms, and left this direction in the old rubric of private baptism, "Let them not doubt, that the child so baptized, is lawfully and sufficiently baptized, and ought not to be baptized again." 5th. Lastly, from the inconveniences that would attend the contrary practice among the whole congregation of Christians. For if none, but a priest every way qualified without exception, might in any case baptize, how great a part of faithful and pious Christians would want the seal of their Christianity? Or, who could be certain, that he himself was baptized in every respect as he ought to be? For one that was never ordained may take upon him the person of a priest. Or, perhaps, one may take holy orders, who never was baptized. Or, if he was baptized and ordained, he may be consecrated by a bishop who was no lawful bishop, nor had any power to give imposition of hands to others. These and such like doubts both may, and often do happen, as reason and experience testify. Whence he concludes upon the whole matter, "that baptism is valid, though given by a layman or woman, having the perpetual consent of the Church, and not being repugnant to the truth of the divine oracles." This writer read his lectures in Oxford in the year 1597. And about five or six years after there was a treatise published in the name of the whole University of Oxford, wherein the same doctrine is defended. This was the answer to the Millenary Petition. The title is, "The Answer of the University of Oxford to a Petition of some Ministers of the church of England, desiring Reformation of certain ceremonies." Oxon. 1603—4to. At Cambridge the same assertion was maintained by Whitaker,[1] as Dr. Forbes alleges him,[2] who dislikes his opinion. And if Archbishop Abbot was a competent judge of the books then written, there were few or none of the church of England in those days that determined otherwise. Many were inclined to censure lay-baptism as irregular and unlawful, but they all agreed in this, that it was valid, and not to be repeated as a mere nullity, when once it was done. "The present times," says he,[3] "as far as I can judge, have not departed from the determination of their forefathers, but keep it as a *depo-*

---

[1] Whitaker. de Baptismo. Q. iii. c. 1. [2] Forbes. instruct. Histor. Theol. lib. x. c. 14. [3] Abbot. Prælect. de Bapt. ii. p. 104. Nostra etiam tempora, quantum ego novi, ab eorum determinatione non discesserunt, sed tanquam depositum apud nos, et traditum custodiunt.

situm handed down from them." Cartwright indeed, and his followers, who affected the French discipline more than they did the English, went generally the other way, and declared openly not only against the lawfulness, but the validity of lay-baptisms in any case whatsoever. And therefore they continually declaimed against the old rubric of private baptism, and importunately called for an alteration. This, among other things, brought on the Conference at Hampton-Court, the result of which was, that the rubric should be made a little more plain by inserting the words "lawful minister," instead of the general term, "one of them that be present," as it was ambiguously worded before. This determined the question about the lawfulness of lay-baptism so far, as that now it could not well be thought to be permitted or enjoined by the Church. But as to the other question, about the validity of lay-baptisms when done, the divines of the Church determined still the same way that they had done before. For though some alteration was made in the rubric, and the words "lawful minister" inserted: yet they thought still no intimation was given, that private baptisms, by any other beside a lawful minister, should be esteemed absolutely null and invalid; nor any provision made in that case that they should be repeated. Isaac Casaubon, who wrote by the order of King James, and in defence of him against Cardinal Perron, some years after the conference at Hampton-Court, speaks thus in the name of the church of England;[1] "what was heretofore said by Tertullian concerning the primitive Church, that baptism was administered by bishops, priests, and deacons; and that laymen also, in cases of extreme necessity, might do it; the very same is now observed in the church of England, so far as concerns bishops, presbyters, and deacons, without tying them strictly to any rigid observation of time or place: and for the baptism of lay-persons, men or women, though she for-

[1] Casaubon. Respon. ad Epist. Perron. p. 33. Lond. 1612. Quod igitur de nascente olim Ecclesia dixit Tertullianus, baptizare episcopum, presbyterum, diaconum: postremo etiam laicis jus esse, in extremæ videlicet necessitatis casu; hoc ipsum in Ecclesia Anglicana, quod ad episcopos, presbyteros et diaconos hodieque servatur, sine ulla vel loci vel temporis rigida et penitus inviolabili observatione: laicorum vero baptismum, aut fæminarum, ut fieri legibus suis vetat, sic factum ex legitima formula quodammodo non improbat, baptismum esse pronuncians, etsi non legitime administratum.

bid it to be done by her laws, yet when it is done in due form, she does not altogether disallow or reject it, pronouncing it to be baptism, though not lawfully administered."

King James asserted the same in the Hampton-Court conference: for though he so expounded the necessity of baptism, as that it was only necessary to be had, where it might be lawfully had, that is, ministered by lawful ministers, by whom alone, and by no private person, he thought it might in any case be administered; yet he said,[1] he utterly disliked all rebaptisation, although either women or laics had baptised.

And indeed he showed his dislike upon some particular occasions: for when one Mr. Crompton had written a book, called St. Austin's Religion, wherein he had asserted,[2] "that for a layman, and much more for a woman, to baptize, in case of necessity, was, in St. Austin's opinion, a pardonable sin; though pardonable, yet a sin, and the usurping of another's office;" Dr. Featley tells us,[3] King James, in part disliked that which Mr. Crompton had delivered. And when he defended himself, by saying, "that in the conference at Hampton-Court, women's baptizing was utterly condemned; and whereas before women were allowed to baptize in case of necessity, the new rubric restrained baptism to the lawful minister:" the King excepted to this answer, and told him, "That in all the several impressions of the book of Common-prayer, there was nothing said of a woman's baptizing neither to warrant it to be done, nor to condemn it when it was done. Neither doth St. Austin simply condemn a layman or woman baptizing in case of necessity, as a sin, but saith, either it is no fault or a pardonable one." And this, he said, was the sum of the resolution at Hampton-Court in this point, howsoever some had mistaken it. By which it plainly appears, what was the judgment of King James concerning the sense and practice of the English church, that though she had given no authority to lay-persons to baptize, yet neither did she absolutely condemn it, when it was done, or by any public act order it to be repeated. This was the King's judgment, delivered upon this occasion a few weeks before his death.

In the reign of King Charles the First, one Ambrose Fisher wrote

---

[1] Conference at Hampton-Court, p. 18. [2] Crompton's Relig. of St. Austin, p. 95. [3] Featley's Cygnea Cantio, p. 21.

a defence of the Liturgy of the church of England, Lond. 1630, wherein he maintains the same assertion, "that though laymen were prohibited to baptize; yet when it was done, their baptism was valid and not to be repeated."

Dr. Forbes indeed, the learned Scotch professor, set himself to oppose this in a particular dissertation among his Historical Theological Instructions,[1] where the reader may find the whole strength of the contrary side. But he goes upon such principles as cannot possibly be maintained by any English divine, nor were ever maintained by any ancient writer; for he argues as much against the lawfulness and validity of baptism administered by deacons, as by laymen; when yet nothing can be plainer than the power and authority which the Church gives them in the office and form of their ordination; for they are told, "that it appertaineth to the office of a deacon in the Church, in the absence of the priest, to baptize infants," and accordingly when the bishop says, "take thou authority to execute the office of a deacon, in the Church of God committed unto thee," it must be understood, that, among other things, the power and authority of baptizing is conferred upon them. But now, if the baptism of deacons be invalid, as Dr. Forbes asserts, if none but a priest can administer it, nor grant absolution and pardon of sins, which belongs to that sacrament; then the church of England has been hitherto mistaken in conferring orders upon deacons, and investing them with authority to baptize. But if the Church has power to authorise deacons to baptize, then their baptism is not only valid, but authorised and authentic too. And that learned person, and all others, who invalidate the baptism of deacons, upon this principle, that they want sacerdotal powers, are under a great mistake, to oppose a practice so firmly established in the constitution of the church of England. However it be, it is certain, there is a manifest opposition betwixt him and the Church upon this head; and therefore he cannot be supposed to speak the sense of our Church, when he invalidates the baptism of deacons. Nor does he produce any rule of the Church to invalidate the baptism of laymen, but proceeds upon other grounds, which have been considered in the foregoing parts of this discourse.

Bishop Taylor also argues for the invalidity of laymen's baptism

---

[1] Forbes. Instruct. Hist. lib. x. c. xiv.

in any case whatsoever:[1] but he does not pretend the Church has given any order to rebaptize such as are unlawfully baptized by laymen. Nor do I know any author, till of late, that has pleaded the authority of the Church for rebaptization in such cases; but the sense which was given by Casaubon and King James has generally passed for the sense of the church of England. And indeed if the Church had intended more, it had been easy, when she altered her rubric, forbidding any but a lawful minister to baptize, to have inserted a further order and decree, to rebaptize all such as were otherwise baptized; as the French church did, both in her Canons and Book of Discipline, because she thought all baptisms, that were not given by a lawful minister to be absolutely null and void. Which the church of England having never yet done, it may be presumed it was not her sense to make her discipline so rigorous, as that of the French church in requiring rebaptization. At least Casaubon and King James, who were very capable of knowing her sense, so understood it, and we do not find many that have been inclined to contradict them. So that, upon the whole, it must be concluded, for any thing that yet appears to the contrary, that what Casaubon said in the name of King James is the present sense of the church of England: she forbids laymen or women, by her laws to baptize; but if it be done in due form, though she does not approve of it, yet she does not wholly disannul it, or order it to be repeated, as absolutely null and void. And whether any alteration is proper to be made in this affair, is none of my province to determine: I have performed, as far as I could, the part of a faithful historian, to correct the errors of some, and inform the judgment of others, and leave the rest to be determined in a lawful assembly.

[1] Taylor Ductor Dubitant lib. iii. c. 4. rule xv. p. 638.

II.

ATTEMPT MADE AT THE REFORMATION TO REVIVE THE ANCIENT DISCIPLINE IN REGARD TO FREQUENT COMMUNION.

[Bingham's Origines Ecclesiasticæ, Book xv. Chapter ix. Section 7.]

Some attempt was made by the first reformers to rectify these abuses, and restore frequent and general communions in many places. And they happily carried their point so far, as to abolish private masses in all places: but the restoring the ancient way of the whole Church's communicating every Lord's day, was a matter not so easy to be effected; partly by reason of the prejudices which men had imbibed by the prevalency and long duration of contrary custom; and partly by reason of that affection which men retain for their vices, which will not suffer them to comply with an institution, that requires a constant purity of soul, and a conscience always void of offence, to qualify them for a worthy reception of a weekly or daily commmunion. Calvin laboured hard at his first coming to Geneva to establish a monthly or a weekly communion, as most agreeable to the practice of the Apostles and the primitive Church: he pleads earnestly for it in his Institutions,[1] where he censures the popish custom of communicating only once a year, as most certainly the invention of the devil: yet after all he could not prevail to have so much as a monthly communion settled among the people, but was over-borne in his endeavours, and forced to yield to a rule, which requires the people to communicate only four times a year. However, he says,[2] he "took care to have it entered upon record, that this was an evil custom, to the intent that posterity might with more ease and liberty correct it." But whether it ever was corrected to this day, is what I am ignorant of: most probably it never was, since I have had occasion to show in another work,[3] communicating

[1] Calvin. Instit. lib. iv. cap. xvii. n. 46. [2] Calvin Respons. de quibusdam Eccles. Ritibus. p. 206. [3] French Church's Apology for the Church of England, book iii. chap. 14.

only four times a year, continued to be the general standing custom in the French church. Their discipline required no more, though they encouraged more frequent reception. The church of England was a little happier in her attempts of this kind. For though her rules require the people in general to receive but three times a year, as of necessary ecclesiastical obligation; yet in our cathedral churches the eucharist is ordinarily celebrated every Lord's day; as it is also in some of the London parish churches; and others both in city and country have monthly communions. Yet there remains a great deal still to be done, to bring this matter to the primitive standard. For even in our cathedrals the communions are very thin, and there is still room for those complaints of St. Chrysostom, In vain do we stand at the altar, in vain is the daily sacrifice offered, there are none, in a manner, that communicate. The churches are crowded to hear the sermon, but when the time of the holy mysteries comes, they are empty and deserted. Men are earnest to hear their fellow servant preach an eloquent discourse, but when Christ the common Lord and master of all is ready to appear, and entertain them, they fly, though never so kindly invited, from his table. This must needs grieve the hearts of all pious servants of Christ, who stand there to minister in his name, whilst few hearken to their admonitions, and the generality excuse themselves from communicating, as if it were no Christian duty. And in country parishes the matter is still more deplorable, where the despair of success deters the minister from attempting it. For here men are generally so averse to a weekly communion, that they will not be prevailed upon with all the serious exhortations that can be used, to comply with the standing rules of the Church, which oblige them to communicate three times a year, though the minister himself be under an obligation to present every such non-communicant as a notorious delinquent. "But if the foundations be cast down, what can the righteous do?" Experience tells us, it is as much labour in vain to present a negligent people for not communicating three times a year, as it is gravely to exhort them to a weekly communion.

This discouragement, which ministers commonly meet with, in trying to bring men to comply with the stated rules of communicating three times a year by Church censures, which are wholly neglected, makes them despair of going any higher towards the perfec-

tion of the primitive practice: since they, who cannot be prevailed upon by the present discipline to communicate three times a year, are too obstinate and stubborn to hearken to any the most serious admonitions, that can be used to incline them to a weekly communion.

III.

ACCOUNT OF THE EXOMOLOGESIS OR CONFESSION USED IN THE DISCIPLINE OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH, PROVING THAT IT WAS A DIFFERENT THING FROM THE AURICULAR CONFESSION OF THE ROMISH CHURCH.

[Bingham's Origines Ecclesiasticæ, Book xviii. Chapter. iii.]

§ 1.—*The gross mistake of those, who make the* Exomologesis *of the ancient Church to signify auricular Confession.*

There is nothing more common among the polemical writers of the Romish church, than wherever they meet with the words ***Exomologesis*** in any of the ancient writers, to interpret it private or auricular confession, such as is now practised in the communion of that church, and imposed upon them as absolutely necessary to salvation. But they, who with greater judgment and ingenuity among themselves have more narrowly considered the matter, make no scruple to confess, that the *Exomologesis* of the ancients signifies a quite different thing, viz. the whole exercise of public penance, of which public confesssion was a noted part. The learned Albaspinæus very strenuously sets himself to refute this error in the writers of his own party. Cardinal Bellarmin, says he,[1] and Baronius, and Maldonat in his Controversies, and Pamelius in his Commentaries upon Tertullian and Cyprian, lay it down as a certain truth, that the Fathers generally take the word *Exomologesis* for private and auricular confession: but having long and accurately considered all

[1] Albaspin. Observat. lib. ii. cap. 26. p. 153.

the places where it is mentioned, I cannot come in—to their opinion. The Fathers, adds he, always use this word, when they would describe the external rites of penance, viz. weeping, and mourning, and self-accusation, and other the like things, which penitents usually practised in the course of public penance. For no one can be ignorant, that in those first ages, penitents performed a long and laborious penance, wherein they mortified themselves with continual weeping, and stood before the gates of the church to give public testimony of their sorrow for the sin they had committed: moreover, that they cast themselves on the ground at the bishop's feet, and fell down at the knees of the martyrs, and besought all the rest of the faithful, that they would become intercessors to God for them, being clothed in sackcloth, and covered with filthiness and horror: and that when they had gone thus far in their penance, the bishop was used to bring them from the doors into the church, and set them before the presbyters, the deacons, the widows, and all the people; where again they were used to prostrate themselves on the ground, detesting their sins, and commending themselves to the prayers of all, and solemnly protesting, that they would never relapse or return to their former condition again. "And upon this account," says he, "we often find this last rite called *Exomologesis* by the Fathers, because it contained many acts in it, expressing sorrow for the crimes they had committed; in like manner as the whole action and tenor of a penitent's life, whilst he is doing penance, is sometimes called *Exomologesis* by the Fathers." This he proves and confirms from many irrefragable testimonies out of Tertullian, Cyprian, and other ancient writers, which I shall not here relate, but only allege one passage of Tertullian, which comes home to the present purpose. "The *Exomologesis*," says he,[1] "is the discipline of a man's prostrating and humbling himself, enjoining him a conversation, that moves God to mercy and compassion. It obliges a man to change his habit and his diet, to lie in sackcloth and ashes, to defile his body by a neglect of dress and ornament, to afflict his soul with sorrow, and to change his former sinful conversation by a quite contrary practice; to use

[1] Tertul. de Pœnitent. cap. ix. Exomologesis prosternendi et humilificandi hominis disciplina est, conversationem injungens, misericordiæ illicem. De ipso quoque habitu et victu mandat, sacco et cineri incubare, corpus sordibus obscurare, animum mœroribus dejicere, &c.

meat and drink, not to please his appetite, but only for preservation of life; to quicken his prayers and devotion by frequent fastings; to groan and weep, and cry unto the Lord God both day and night; to prostrate himself before the presbyters of the Church, to kneel before the friends of God, and beg of all the brethren, that they would become intercessors for his pardon; all this the *Exomologesis* requires to recommend a true repentance." Here is not a syllable of private or auricular confession, but all relates to the public confession, before the Church; and that not so much in words, as in actions, expressing their repentance in public demonstrations of their sorrow, and the uniform tenor of a penitent behaviour; which was of far greater moment to signify and evidence their conversion, than the most pathetical words of any mere verbal or private confession.

§ 2. *No Necessity of auricular Confession ever urged by the ancient Church.*

And this is one argument to prove, that the doctrine of the necessity of auricular confession was wholly unknown to the ancient Church. For when public discipline was in general use, and all men were disposed to submit to it, there could be little occasion for private confession, the reason and ground of which was much better answered by the public. But besides this, there is most plain and direct evidence from the testimonies of the Ancients, that no necessity was laid upon any man to make private confession of all or any of his secret sins to a priest, as a matter of indispensable obligation, either to qualify him for the reception of the Eucharist, or to give him a title to the communion of the Church and eternal life. I have already shown this, with a particular respect to the reception of the Eucharist, out of some very plain passages of Chrysostom, Gennadius, Laurentius Novariensis,[1] and other ancient writers; to which I shall here add such other testimonies, as evidently show, they required no private confession to be made to man, except in some very particular cases. St. Chrysostom exhorting men to repentance, says,[2] "I bid thee not to bring thyself upon the stage, nor to accuse thyself unto others: but I advise thee to observe the prophet's direction, reveal thy way unto the Lord, confess thy sins

[1] Book xv. chap. 8. sect. 6. [2] Chrys. Hom. xxxi. in Hebr. p. 1966.

before God, confess them before the judge: praying, if not with thy tongue, yet at least with thy memory; and so look to obtain mercy. It is better to be tormented with the memory of thy sins now, than with the torment, that shall be hereafter. If you remember them now, and continually offer them to God, and pray for them, you shall quickly blot them out: but if you forget them now, you will then remember them against your will, when they shall be brought forth before the whole world, and be publicly exposed upon the stage before all, friends, enemies, and angels." In another place,[1] "It is not necessary, that thou shouldst confess in the presence of witnesses; let the inquiry after thy sins be made in thy own thoughts; let this judgment be without any witness; let God only see thee confessing." Again,[2] "I beseech you make your confession continually to God. For I do not bring thee into the theatre of thy fellow-servants, neither do I constrain thee by any necessity to discover thy sins unto men: unfold thy conscience before God, and show Him thy wounds, and ask the cure of Him. Show them to Him, who will not reproach thee, but only heal thee. For although thou confess not, He knows all. Confess therefore, that thou mayest be a gainer. Confess, that thou mayest put off thy sins in this world, and go pure into the next, and avoid that intolerable publication, that will otherwise be made hereafter." "Why art thou ashamed and blushest," says he, in another place,[3] "to confess thy sins? Dost thou discover them to a man, that he should reproach thee? Dost thou confess them to thy fellow-servant, that he should bring thee upon the open stage? Thou only showest thy wound to Him, who is thy Lord, thy Curator, thy Physician, and thy Friend. And He says to thee, I do not compel thee to go into the public theatre, and take many witnesses. Confess thy sin in private to Me alone, that I may heal thy wound, and deliver thee from thy grief." There are almost twenty passages in the same author,[4] very full and pregnant to the same purpose, which

---

[1] Chrys. Hom. de Pœnitent. t. v. Edit. Latin. [2] Hom. xxx. sive 5. De Incomprehensibili Dei Natura, t. i. p. 392. [3] Hom. iv. de Lazaro, t. v. p. 87. [4] Hom. lvii. Quod peccata non sint evulganda, t. v. p. 754. Hom. lviii. Non esse ad gratiam concionandum. t. v. p. 772. Hom. lxviii. de Pœnitentia Ahab. t. v. p. 1003. Hom. xxi. ad Pop. Antioch. t. i. p. 270. Hom. viii. de Pœnitent. t. i. p. 700. Hom. ix. de Pœnitent. ibid. p. 708. Hom. lxii. de Paralytico. t. v. p. 927. Hom. xx. in Gen. t. ii. 222. Hom. ii. in Psal. l. t. 3. p. 1004, et 1005. Hom. xx. in Mat. p. 200. Hom. xxviii. in i. Cor. p. 569.

the learned reader may consult in their proper places, or view them at once collected together by Mr. Daille in his excellent book of Auricular Confession,[1] where he not only vindicates these passages of Chrysostom from the sophistical glosses and evasions of the Romanists, but also has unanswerably proved by no less than thirty arguments, and a cloud of other ancient witnesses, that there could be no such thing as private, auricular, sacramental confession enjoined, as of necessity to pardon of sin, in the primitive Church. Chrysostom is not the only person that maintains this assertion. St. Basil says the same thing before him:[2] "I do not make confession with my lips, to appear to the world; but inwardly in my heart, where no eye sees; I declare my groanings unto Thee alone, who seest in secret, I roar within myself: for I need not many words to make confession: the groanings of my heart are sufficient for confession, and the lamentations, which are sent up to Thee, my God, from the bottom of my soul." In like manner St. Hilary makes confession necessary to be made to God only:[3] for commenting on the fifty-second Psalm, he tells us, David teaches us, that confession is necessary to be made to none but God, who hath made the olive fruitful with the hope of mercy for ever and ever. And St. Ambrose as plainly says,[4] that tears poured out before God are sufficient to obtain pardon of sin, without confession made to man. His words are, "Tears wash away sin, which men are ashamed to confess with their voice. Weeping provides at once both for pardon and bashfulness: tears speak our faults without horror; tears confess our crimes without any offence to modesty or shamefacedness." So again,[5] speaking of St. Peter's tears, he says, "I find not what Peter said, but I find that he wept: I read of tears, but I read not of his satisfaction," meaning, that verbal confession was not simply necessary to obtain pardon. And in this sense St. Austin expounding those words of the Psalmist, "I said I will pronounce or declare my own wickedness against myself unto the Lord, and so Thou forgavest the

---

[1] Daill. de Confess. Auricular. lib. iv. cap. 25. [2] Basil. in Psal. xxxvii. viii. [3] Hilar. in Psal. li. p. 208. Nulli alii docens confitendum, quam qui fecit olivam fructiferam spe misericordiæ in seculum seculi. [4] Ambros. lib. x. in Luc. 22. Lavant lacrymæ delictum, quod pudor est voce confiteri. Et veniæ fletus consulunt et verecundiæ, &c. [5] Ibid. p, 157. Non invenio quid dixerit Petrus; invenio quod fleverit. Lacrymas ejus lego; satisfactionem ejus non lego.

iniquity of my heart," says, "he had not yet pronounced it,[1] but only promised, that he would pronounce it, and yet God forgave him. He had not yet pronounced it, but only in his heart; his confession was not yet come to his mouth, yet God heard the voice of his heart; his voice was not yet in his mouth, but the ear of God was in his heart; which implies, that God accepts and pardons the penitent and contrite heart, even before any formal declaration is made by vocal confession either to God or man." In another place[2] he speaks of confession as no ways necessary to be made to man. "What have I to do with men, that they should hear my confessions, as though they could heal all my diseases?" He also frequently tells us,[3] with all the rest of the ancient writers, that a great many of those, which the Romanists now call mortal sins, were daily pardoned upon no other confession but the fervent and devout use of that of the Lord's Prayer, "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us." Which evidently shows, that he did not believe auricular confession necessary for expiating all manner of mortal sins. Maximus Taurinensis[4] delivers his opinion almost in the same words as St. Ambrose does: "Tears wash away sin, which the voice is ashamed to confess. Therefore tears provide at once both for men's modesty and salvation; they neither make men blush in their petitions, nor disappoint them of pardon in asking." He adds, "that tears are a sort of silent prayers: they ask not pardon in words, and yet deserve it, (that is, in his style, procure it) they declare not the cause, and yet obtain mercy. Nay the prayers of tears are many times of more advantage, than those of words; because words often prove deceitful in prayer, but tears never deceive. For words sometimes declare but half the business; but tears always express the whole affection." Prosper,

---

[1] Aug. Ser. ii. in Psal. 31. [2] Aug. Confess. lib. x. cap. 3. Quid mihi ergo est cum hominibus, ut audiant confessiones meas, quasi ipsi sanaturi sint omnes languores meos? [3] See this fully proved, book xvi. chap. 3. sect. 14. [4] Max. Taurin. Hom. iii. de Pœnit. Petri. Lavat lacryma delictum, quod voce pudor est confiteri. Lacrymæ ergo verecundiæ consulunt pariter et saluti; nec erubescunt in petendo, et impetrant in rogando.——Lacrymæ tacitæ quodammodo preces sunt; veniam non postulant, et merentur; causam non dicunt, et misericordiam consequuntur; nisi quod utiliores lacrymarum preces sunt, quam sermonum; quia sermo in precando forte fallit, lacryma omnino non fallit. Sermo enim interdum non totum profert negotium; lacryma semper totum prodit affectum.

who was St. Austin's scholar, follows his doctrine: for, speaking of private sins committed by the clergy, he says,[1] "They shall more easily appease God, who being not convict by human judgment, do of their own accord acknowledge their offence; who either do discover it by their own confessions, or else others not knowing what they are in secret, do voluntarily inflict the sentence of excommunication upon themselves; and being separated, not in mind, but in office, from the altar, to which they did minister, do lament their life as dead; assuring themselves, that God being reconciled unto them by fruits of effectual repentance, they shall not only receive what they have lost, but also being made citizens of that city which is above, they shall come to everlasting joys." Cassian also assures us, that this was the doctrine of the Egyptian Fathers. For he says, Pinuphius, the Egyptian Abbot, gave his advice to the monks that were under him: "Who is it that cannot humbly say? 'I made my sin known unto Thee, and my iniquity have I not hid;' that by this confession he may confidently adjoin that, which follows: 'and so Thou forgavest the impiety of my heart.' But if shamefacedness so draw thee back,[2] that thou blushest to reveal them before men; cease not by continual supplication to confess them unto Him from whom they cannot be hid, and to say, 'I know my iniquity, and my sin is against me, alway:' to Thee only have I sinned, and done evil before Thee, whose custom is both to cure without publishing our shame, and to pardon sins without accusing or upbraiding." These are plain testimonies, evidently showing that the Ancients did not believe the necessity of auricular confession, or urge it as a thing absolutely necessary to absolution and salvation.

§ 3.—*This proved further from the Practice of the Ancients in denying all Manner of Absolution to some relapsing Sinners, without excluding them from the Mercy and Pardon of God upon Confession to Him alone.*

But besides this the practice of the Ancients, in one particular case, does most irrefragably show, that they did not believe the ne-

---

[1] Prosper. de Vita Contemplat. lib. ii. cap. 7. Deum facilius placabunt qui non humano convicti judicio, &c. [2] Cassian. Collat. xx. cap. 8. Quod si verecundia retrahente, revelare ea coram hominibus erubescis, illi quem latere non possunt, confiteri ea jugi supplicatione non defnas, &c.

cessity of auricular confession. For they allowed no second public penance to many relapsing sinners, nor ever gave them any manner of sacerdotal absolution to their lives end: which shall be evidently demonstrated in the next chapter. Now the plain consequence of this is, that no penitential confession, either public or private, was taken from such, as made to man, in order to obtain sacerdotal absolution: yet still they exhorted them to repent in private, and make private confession of their sins to God, in hopes of obtaining mercy and pardon from him at the great day of retribution. It is confessed on all hands, that such relapsers never had the privilege to make their public confession in the Church, in order to obtain public absolution: and it is as certain they were not admitted to compound by any private sacerdotal confession, to obtain private sacerdotal absolution. For though Cardinal Perron had a strong fancy to solve the difficulty of this argument, by feigning a sort of private confession for them, when they were denied the public; yet Petavius himself refutes this pretence,[1] as a mere dream without any foundation in ancient history, and gives a solid reason to the contrary. For as he argues, if private confession had been allowed to such relapsers, their condition had been happier, and their penance easier, than those who fell but once: which is a thing, that will hardly enter into any man's imagination, that considers things with any manner of judgment and reason. Supposing then the truth of this fact, that the Ancients allowed such relapsers neither the benefit of public nor private absolution upon any confession whatsoever: it evidently follows, that they did not believe any absolute necessity of auricular confession, since they encouraged such sinners notwithstanding to hope for mercy and pardon upon private repentance and confession made to God only. For the proof of which, one passage of St. Austin will be sufficient, where he speaks the general practice of the Church, and the sense of all his brethren. "The iniquity of men," says he, "sometimes proceeds so far, that after they have done public penance, after they have been reconciled to the altar, they commit the same or greater sins; and yet God makes his sun to rise even upon such, and bestows upon them no less than before the greatest gifts of life and salvation. And though there be no place allowed to such in the

[1] Petav. Not. in Epiphan. p. 238.

Church,[1] to perform that humble sort of penance again, yet God does not forget his patience toward them. But if any of these should say to us, either grant me the same place of repentance again, or else suffer me to go on desperately, to live as I list, to do whatever my riches will enable me to do, and no human laws will forbid me, to live in whoredom and all manner of luxury, which though damnable before the Lord, is even laudable in the eyes of many men: or if ye recall me from this wickedness, tell me whether it will profit me any thing towards eternal life, if in this life I contemn the blandishments of enticing pleasure, if I bridle the excitements of lust, if for the chastisement of my body I deny myself many things, that are lawful and allowed, if I torment myself more vehemently in repentance, than I did before, if I groan more miserably, and weep more abundantly, if I live better, if I more liberally sustain the poor, if I more ardently flame in charity, which covers a multitude of sins: which of us is so foolish, as to say to this man, all this will profit thee nothing hereafter, go and enjoy the pleasures of this life? God forbid we should be guilty of so monstrous and sacrilegious madness. Therefore though it be a cautious and salutary rule and provision in the ecclesiastical law, that this place of the humblest penance shall not be granted above once in the Church, lest by making the medicine too vile and cheap, it should become less useful to those that are sick, being so much the more beneficial, by how much it is less contemptible: yet who dares to say to God, why dost Thou spare this man, who after his first penance binds himself again in the bonds of iniquity? Who dares say, that God deals not with them according to that saying of the Apostle, 'Knowest thou not that the long-suffering of God leadeth thee to repentance?' Or that they are excepted from that general declaration, 'Blessed are all they that put their trust in him?' Or that it belongs not to them, when it is said, 'Be strong, and establish your heart all ye that put your trust in the Lord?'" If St. Austin here rightly represents the practice of the Church, in this one case, there was no use made either of public or private confession to men, to obtain the remission of the greatest sins; but men were directed to another method, to seek pardon

[1] Aug. Ep. liv. ad Macedon. p. 92. Quamvis eis in ecclesia locus humillimæ pœnitentiæ non concedatur, Deus tamen super eos suæ patientiæ non oblivi-scitur. &c.

from God by the exercise of a private repentance. Consequently there could be no absolute necessity of auricular confession, which in this case had been most likely to have been prescribed in want of the other, had any such necessity been taught or laid upon it, as is now by the imperious and dictating authority of the church of Rome.

§ 4.—*And from several other considerations of the like Nature.*

The learned Mr. Daille, has urged many other considerations of great weight, which I cannot here insist upon, but only mention the heads of them, for the sake of the unlearned readers, or such of the learned as have not that excellent and elaborate work of his by them. 1. He argues from the practice of all other churches in the world beside the Roman;[1] the doctrine of the necessity of auricular confession, is taught by no other denomination of Christians, not the Ethiopians, nor the Indians of St. Thomas, nor the Babylonians or Chaldeans, nor the Armenians, nor the Jacobites, nor the Greeks in the manner of the Romans. 2. He shows, that whereas priests in the Roman church are nicely instructed in the business of auricular confession, and teach and minister it daily to the people, as the noblest act of their office; there is nothing of all this to be found in the genuine writings of the ancient Christians. 3. Whereas auricular confession is continually mentioned by the Roman writers, among the religious acts of all sorts of men, clergy, monks, laity, princes, private men, noblemen, plebians, men, women, &c., there is nothing of this among the ancient Christians. 4. In the ancient Church, Christians were bound by no law, as now they are in the Roman, to confess their sins to a priest before they came to the Lord's table, to receive the eucharist. Which he demonstrates by eight reasons, and the testimony of Chrysostom, Pelagius, Austin, Dorotheus, the Council of Chalon and Hincmar. 5. In the Roman church, it is usual for every one to make his auricular confession at the point of death; of which there are no foot-steps among the Ancients. 6. The Romish writers are very full of auricular confession in describing any of the sicknesses, or calamities, or wars, or shipwrecks, or journeys, or other hazardous undertakings of their people: but there was no such practice among the Ancients. 7. The Ancients in describing the persecutions of the Church, or the con-

[1] Dail. de. Confess. Auricular lib. iv. cap. 1, &c.

flicts and trials and last agonies of their confessors and martyrs, never mention auricular confession, which yet abounds every where in the Romish writers, when they make any such relations of the lives or deaths of their martyrs. 8. The Ancients had no solemn times appointed for auricular confession, as Easter, Christmas, Lent, the greater festivals, and the Friday and Saturday fasts, which are now every where spoken of, in the Romish writers, as solemn times of confession. 9. The Ancients say nothing of miracles done in or by confession, which the Romanists continually boast of. 10. The Ancient Pagans never objected auricular confession to the Primitive Christians, as the modern pagans do to those of the Roman communion. 11. The ancient Church knew nothing of heretics opposing auricular confession, because there was no such thing enjoined; but since it was appointed by the Council of Lateran, Anno 1215, many have been condemned as heretics for opposing it. 12. The primitive bishops often declare, that they were ignorant of the sins of their people; particularly this is said by Chrysostom, Austin, Innocent, and Leo, bishops of Rome: which is an argument, that they were not revealed to them by sacramental confession. 13. The first man, that instituted any private confession, was St. Anthony, who appointed his monks to write down their thoughts, and communicate them one to another: but this was nothing to sacerdotal confession; for these monks were only laymen. 14. The ancient writers have none of those intricate questions and disputations about auricular confession, which so much stuff the books of the modern casuists in the church of Rome. 15. The Fathers never interpret those passages of Scripture, which the Romanists produce for auricular confession, in their sense, but most of them to a contrary meaning. 16. The Fathers in those Books, which they wrote professedly of repentance, never urge auricular confession as a necessary part of repentance. 17. The Fathers acknowledged only three sorts of repentance; the ante-baptismal, for all manner of sin; the quotidian or daily repentance, for lesser sins of daily incursion; and the public penance of lapsers, falling into more heinous sins; but auricular confession appertains to none of these. 18. Gregory Nyssen says expressly there were some sins,[1] such as covetousness, which the Fa-

[1] Nyssen. Ep. ad Letoium.

thers before him endeavoured to cure, not by any canonical punishments, but only by the public exhortations of the word and doctrine: which will not consist with the doctrine of auricular confession. 19. Nectarius wholly abrogated the office of the penitentiary priest. Which argues, that there was no necessity of auricular confession: but of this office we must speak a little more particularly hereafter. 20. His next argument is drawn from those passages of Chrysostom, Hilary, Basil, Ambrose, Maximus Taurinensis, and St. Austin, which have been already mentioned, asserting, that remission of sins may be obtained of God by contrition only, without any oral confession. 21. The Fathers allow salvation to be attainable even by those relapsers, who fell again into sin after their first public penance, though they had no liberty either to make confession or receive absolution. Which argument has been particularly explained already. His 22, 23, and 24 arguments are drawn from the testimonies of Cassian and Julianus Pomerius or Prosper, and Laurentius Novariensis, which has been related before. 25. To these he adds considerable testimonies of Bede. 26. And the concessions of Erasmus, Beatus Rhenanus, and Rigaltius, who freely own, that the Romish auricular confession was not in use in the primitive Church. 27. He shows, that there was a change made of the ancient discipline in the ninth age, when private penance enjoined by the priest began to be pretty frequent and common. 28. And yet this differed vastly in many particulars from the confession established afterwards in the Council of Lateran. For still it was believed, that confession made to God only was sufficient to salvation. 29. In the following ages also, Goffridus Vindocinensis, Peter Lombard, and Gratian,[1] say there were many, who still held that confession to God alone was sufficient without confessing to the priest. And Gratian particularly, having cited the authorities on both sides of the question, leaves it to the judgment of the reader to take which opinion he pleases; because each opinion had wise and religious men to authorize and defend it. Which argues, that in Gratian's time the question about the necessity of auricular confession was not so determined as it was after-

[1] Goffrid. lib. v. ep. 16. Lombard. Distinct. lib. iv. sect. 17. Gratian. de Pœnit. Dist. ii. cap. 89. Cui harum potius adhærendum sit, lectoris judicio reservatur. Utraque enim fautores habet sapientes et religiosos viros.

wards in the Council of Lateran, and the Council of Trent. This is also acknowledged by Aquinas, Bonaventure, and Antonine, who say, that in the time of Gratian and Lombard, the question about the necessity of such confession, was only problematical, and what might safely be disputed both ways, and that it was no heresy to deny it: but after the determination of the Church made under Innocent III. in the Lateran Council, it was to be reputed heresy for any man to assert, that it was sufficient to confess a man's sins to God without making confession to a priest also. 30. Thus the doctrine of auricular confession was established in the thirteenth century, and not before: and even after that there wanted not witnesses, such as Wickliffe, and Huss, and Semeca, and Michael of Bononia, and Petrus Oxomensis, to bear testimony against its novelty, to the time of the Reformation. This is the short account of those thirty arguments, which the learned Mr. Daille uses to show the novelty of the Romish doctrine concerning auricular confession, which, the curious reader, who desires to see them more fully deduced and confirmed, may consult in our author's elaborate work for his further satisfaction.

§ 5. *Yet private confession allowed and encouraged in some Cases. As,* 1. *For lesser Sins, Men were advised to confess mutually to one another, to have their Prayers and Assistance.*

But in all that is said by this or any other Protestant writer, there is no intent to deny, that private confession was allowed and encouraged by the Ancients in some cases, and upon some special occasions. For,

1. They advised all men, in case of lesser sins, to make confession mutually to one another, that they might have each other's prayers and assistance. This is the advice of St. James, v. 16. "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." Which though it be a place commonly produced by the Romanists, for their auricular confession to a priest, yet it was anciently thought no more than a direction to Christians in general to confess their sins mutually to one another. Thus, it is certain, St. Austin understood it: for writing upon those words of our Saviour in St. John, "If I your Lord and master have washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another's feet;" he thus expounds

them and the words of St. James together:[1] "Can we say, that one brother may cleanse another from the contagion of sin? Yes we are taught to do it by the mystical meaning of this work of our Lord, that we should confess our sins one to another, and pray one for another, as Christ intercedes for us. Let us hear St. James the Apostle, evidently commanding this very thing, and saying, 'Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another,' because in this our Lord hath set us an example. For if He, who neither has, nor ever had, nor ever will have any sin, prays for our sins; how much rather ought we to pray for the sins of one another? And if He forgive us, who has nothing to be forgiven by us; how much more ought we to forgive one another, who cannot live here without sin? Let us therefore forgive one another, and pray for each other's sins, that so we may in some measure wash one another's feet." In like manner Eradius, or St. Austin himself in another place says.[2] "We are admonished throughout the whole Scripture to confess our sins continually and humbly, not only to God, but to holy men and those that fear God. For so the Holy Ghost teaches us by James the Apostle, saying, 'Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed.'" Hincmar, a learned French bishop of the ninth age, gives the same interpretation: "Our light and daily sins," says he,[3] "according to the exhortation of St. James, are daily to be confessed to those that are our equals: and such sins we may believe, will be cleansed by their daily prayers, and our own acts of piety, if with a charitable mind we truly say in the Lord's prayer, 'Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.'" And Maldonat says,[4] this was the sense of all the Ancients, alleging not only St. Austin, but Hesychius, and Gregory the Great, and Bede, and the author of the Interlineary Gloss. To which others[5] add Scotus, and Biel, and Dionysius Carthusianus, and Cajetan, Gagnæus, and Godellus, a late bishop, in the French church: however Bellarmin came to fix upon this pas-

---

[1] Aug. Tract. lviii. in Joan. tom. ix. p. 164. [2] Aug. Hom xii. Ex. 1. tom. x. p. 161. [3] Hincmar. Epist. ad Hildeboldum, tom. ii. n. 40. p. 688. Quotidiana autem, leviaque peccata, secundum Jacobi Apostoli hortamentum, alterutrum cœqualibus confitenda sunt, &c. [4] Maldonat. Controver. tom. ii. de Confessione, cap. ii. p. 36. [5] Vid. Daill. de confess. lib. i. cap. 12.

sage of St. James, as a plain proof of auricular confession to a priest, which in the case mentioned, according to the opinion of so many Ancients and Moderns, directs to no other confession, but what may be made to any pious Christian.

§ 6.—2. *In case of injuries done to private persons, men were obliged to confess, and ask pardon of the injured party.*

2. In case of private injuries done to any private person, there was no question ever made, but that the offending party might make a private confession of his fault to the offended party, and give him private satisfaction. For so Christ had appointed, Mat. v. 23. "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." Upon which St. Austin says,[1] "A man may with an unfeigned heart endeavour to pacify and appease him, by asking him pardon, if he does this before God. Nay, it is his only remedy in this case, to ask pardon; which who ever does not, he is puffed up with spirit of vain glory."

§ 7.—3. *When they were under any troubles of conscience, they were advised to make private confession to a minister, to have his counsel and direction.*

3. When men were under perplexities of mind, or troubles of conscience, from the pressure and load of sin; that was another case, in which they were always directed to have recourse to some wise and prudent pastor, to take his counsel and advice, and his assistance, and his prayers, as a sort of mediator and intercessor under Christ for them. The Romish writers are apt to allege many passages out of the ancients, which upon examination and strict enquiry amount to no more than this. Thus Clemens Romanus, or the author under his name, bids every one, into whose heart either envy or infidelity, or any such crime, has slily crept, not be ashamed, if he has any care of his soul, to confess his sin to the bishop or minister

[1] Aug. de Sermone Dom. in Monte, lib. i. cap. 10. Poteris eum non stimulato animo lenire, atque in gratiam revocare, veniam postulando, si hoc prius coram Deo feceris——Quod est unum remedium, supplici animo veniam deprecetur: quod quisquis non fecerit inanis jactantiæ spiritu inflatur.

presiding over him,[1] that by the word of God and his saving counsel he may be healed. And so Maldonat owns,[2] this has no relation to sacramental confession. The same advice is given by Origen, Gregory Nyssen,[3] and St. Basil,[4] upon the like occasion, to confess their sins to the priest, who by his compassion and skilfulness was able to help their infirmities, and at once take care both of their credit and cure.

§ 8.—4. *To take his advice also, whether it was proper to do public penance for private offences.*

4. Origen gives another reason for confessing private sins to the priest, because he was best able to judge, whether it were proper for such sins to admit men to do public penance in the church, which in those days was no unusual practice. "Consider," says he,[5] "what the holy Scripture teaches us, that we ought not to conceal our sin within our own breast. For perhaps as they, who are inwardly oppressed with the humour or phlegm of indigested meat, which lies heavy upon the stomach, if they vomit it up, are relieved; so they, who have sinned, if they hide and conceal their sin within themselves, are inwardly oppressed, and almost suffocated with the phlegm and humour of sin: but if any become his own accuser, and confess his sin, in so doing he as it were vomits up his sin, and digests and removes the cause of his distemper. Only be circumspect in the choice of him to whom it will be fit to confess thy sin. Try first the physician, to whom thou art to reveal the cause of thy distemper and see that he be one, who knows how to be weak with him that is weak, and to weep with him that weeps; one who understands the discipline of condoling and compassionating; that so at length, if he shall say any thing, who hath first shown himself to be both a skilful and a merciful physician, and give thee any counsel, thou mayest observe and follow it. If he discerns and foresees thy distemper to be such, as will need to be declared and cured in the full assembly of the Church, whereby others perhaps may be edified, and

[1] Clem. Ep. i. ad Jacob. Non erubescat qui animæ suæ curam gerit, hæc confiteri ei qui præest, ut ab ipso per verbum Dei et consilium salubre curetur. [2] Maldonat. de Confess cap. ii. p. 40 tom. ii. [3] Nyssen. de Pœnitent. tom. iii. p. 176. [4] Basil. Regul. Brev. Resp. 229. [5] Orig. Hom. ii. in Psal. 37 tom. i. p. 471.

thou thyself healed, this is to be done with great deliberation, and the prudent advice of such a physician." It is very plain, that in this case this sort of private confession was made in order to take the advice concerning doing public penance for any private sin; and that men had recourse to him in private, as to one, who was best able to judge, whether their sin were of such a nature, as would require a public humiliation and repentance. For this, as I said before, was no unusual thing in those days, for men sometimes to desire to do public penance for private offences; yea, even for the very intention and design of some grosser sins, though they never proceeded so far as the outward action. Cyprian speaks of some such offenders, who reckoned themselves guilty of idolatry,[1] not because they had either actually sacrificed to idols, or procured any libel to signify their so doing, but only because they had designed in their hearts to do it: who therefore confessed their wicked intention to the priests, in order to do public penance for it (though it was but a small sin in comparison) as knowing that it was written, "God is not mocked." These private sins after secret confession were sometimes publicly declared and read out of a libel in the congregation: but all bishops did not approve of this practice:[2] and therefore when Pope Leo understood that several bishops in the provinces of Campania, Samnium, and Picenum took this method, he wrote a sharp letter to them, complaining of it as an unlawful usurpation and irregular practice, to put those who made secret confession to the priests, upon a public rehearsal of their crimes afterwards in the face of the congregation: which custom ought by all means to be abrogated and laid aside. For though it may seem a very laudable plenitude of faith, that for the fear

---

[1] Cypr. de Lapsis, p. 134. Quamvis nullo sacrificii aut libelli facinore constricti, quoniam tamen de hoc vel cogitaverunt, hoc ipsum apud sacerdotes Dei dolenter et simpliciter confitentes, exomologesin conscientiæ faciunt, animi sui pondus exponunt, salutarem medelam parvis licet et modicis vulneribus exquirunt; scientes scriptum esse, Deus non deridetur. [2] Leo. Ep. lxxx. al. 78. ad Episc. Campan. Illam etiam contra apostolicam regulam præsumptionem, quam nuper agnovi a quibusdam illicita usurpatione committi, modis omnibus constituo submoveri, ne de singulorum peccatorum genere libellis scripta professio publice recitetur, cum reatus conscientiarum sufficiat solis sacerdotibus indicari confessione secreta, &c. Vid. Basil. can. lxi. et lxiii. Paulin. Vit. Ambros. p. 10. Ambros. de Pœnit. lib. i. c. 16. Gennad. de Dogm. Eccles. cap. liii.

of God makes men not afraid to take shame before men; yet because all men's sins, which come under penance, are not such as they are not afraid to have made public, this unreasonable custom ought to be altered, lest many should be driven from the remedy of repentence, whilst either they are ashamed or afraid to have their actions laid open before their enemies, who perhaps might take occasion from thence to bring them into danger of the civil laws, and the penalties imposed by them upon such offences. Which last words of Leo suggest a further reason why the Ancients in some cases allowed of private confession, even when penance itself in its exercise was to be public. For we may observe,

§ 9.—5. *When there was any danger of Death arising from the Laws of the State against certain offences.*

5. That when there was any apparent danger to men's lives or otherwise, arising from the penalties of the civil laws, inflicting capital punishments on certain offences; in that case the Church was content to take a private confession of sinners, and excuse them from a dangerous publication. It is of this case St. Austin speaks, when he says,[1] "we ought to correct secret sins in secret, lest if we publicly reprove them, we betray the man. We would reprove and correct him: but what if an enemy lies upon the catch, to hear something for which he may punish him? A bishop, (put the case,) perhaps knows a man to be a murderer, and besides himself no one else knows it: I would publicly rebuke the man, but then you would seek to take the law upon him. In this case I neither betray the man or neglect him: I reprove him in secret; I set before his eyes the judgment of God; I terrify his bloody conscience, and persuade him to repentance. It happened also that sometimes persons confessed such secret sins, as though they would not endanger their lives by a regular course of law, yet might provoke an injured party, if he knew them, in a sudden fit of zeal and passion to destroy them. In this case it was thought more proper to let the confession and penance be both in private, lest any such inconvenience might fol-

[1] Aug. Ser. xvi. de Verb. Dom. cap. viii. In secreto debemus arguere, in secreto corripere: ne volentes publice arguere, prodamus hominem. Nos volumus corripere et corrigere: quid si inimicus quærit audire quod puniat? &c.

low upon the publication. St. Basil instances in the case of a woman[1] that confesses herself guilty of adultery: the law allowed not the husband to kill her, except he took her in the very act: but it might happen, that in his zeal and fury he might be tempted even against law to kill her, if by any means he came to understand that she had been guilty of such a transgression: therefore to avoid the occasion of any such temptation, it was ordered, that no minister should "δημοσιεύειν, *publish* the crime of women under penance of adultery upon their own confession, lest it should occasion their death;" that is, expose them to the fury of their husbands, who might be inclined, in the height of passion, to exceed all bounds, and do what by law they could not answer.

§ 10.—6. *Private Confession required in case of private Admonition for Offences.*

5. I remember but one case more, in which any thing like private confession was required; and that was, when any man was rebuked for a crime by his spiritual guide, of which he was either notoriously guilty, or violently suspected: in that case it was his duty to give glory to God, and take shame to himself, by an ingenuous confession and acknowledgment of his fault, to answer the true end of private admonition. It is of this sort of confession St. Ambrose speaks in the person of David,[2] when he says, that being rebuked by a private man for his great offence, he did not fret and fume with indignation, but ingenuously confess his fault, and mourn with sorrow for it.

§ 11. *The Office of the penitentiary Priest set up in many churches to receive and regulate such private Confessions.*

All these sorts of private confession were anciently allowed of, as consistent with the standing and ordinary discipline of public confession and penance in the church. And the better to regulate them, and direct men what to do in such cases, there was a particular officer appointed in many churches under the name of the peniten-

---

[1] Basil. can. xxxiv. [2] Ambros. de Apolog. David cap. ii. Cum a privato homine corriperetur, quod graviter deliquisset, non indignatus infremuit, sed confessus ingenuit culpæ dolore.

tiary priest: whose office was not to receive private confessions in prejudice to the public discipline; much less to grant absolution privately upon bare confession before any penance was performed; which was a practice altogether unknown to the ancient Church, as we shall see more hereafter: But it was to facilitate and promote the exercise of public discipline, by acquainting men what sins the laws of the Church required to be expiated by public penance, and how they were to behave themselves in the performance of it; and only to appoint private penance for such private crimes as were not proper to be brought upon the public stage, either for fear of doing harm to the penitent himself, or giving scandal to the Church.

§ 12. *This office afterwards obrogated, and Men were entirely left to their Liberty, as to what concerned private Confession.*

The whole history of the first original and institution of this office in the time of the Decian persecution, and the abrogation of it by Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, in the time of Theodosius, is entirely owing to the relation of Socrates and Sozomen, two historians, who lived in the same age that the office was abolished; and therefore it will be proper to relate it in their words first, and then make a few remarks upon it. Socrates,[1] speaking of the reign of Theodosius, says, "About this time it was thought propror to remove the *penitentiary presbyters*—τὰς ἐπὶ της μετανοίας πρεσβυτέρας, out of the churches on this occasion. From the time that the Novations made their separation from the Church, refusing to communicate with those that lapsed in the Decian persecution, the bishops added *to the ecclesiastical roll*—(τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν κανόνι)—a penitential presbyter; that they, who fell into any sins after baptism, might make confession of them before the presbyter thereto appointed. And this order continues still among other sects; only they who receive the consubstantial doctrine, and the Novatians who agree with them in the same faith, are equally now agreed to reject the penitential presbyter. The Novatians, indeed, never admitted this additional office from the beginning; and the present governors of the churches, though they allowed it for a long time, yet now under Nectarius laid it aside, upon a certain accident that happened in the

[1] Socrat. lib. v. cap. 19.

Church. For a certain gentlewoman coming to the penitentiary presbyter, made particular confession of her sins that she had committed after baptism. And the presbyter enjoined her to fast and pray continually, that together with her confession she might show forth works worthy of repentance. But the woman proceeding in the course of her penance, accused herself of another sin: for she confessed, that one of the deacons of the Church had defiled her. Which occasioned the deacon to be cast out of the Church; and there was no small stir among the people, who were incensed not barely for the fact, but because it brought great scandal and reproach upon the Church. And the clergy being chiefly reviled upon this occasion, one Eudæmon, a presbyter of the Church, born at Alexandria, gave counsel to Nectarius to take away the penitentiary presbyter, and leave it to every man's liberty to partake of the holy mysteries according to the direction of his own conscience: for this was the only way to free the Church from reproach." This, he says, he the more confidently inserted into his history, because he had it from the mouth of Eudæmon himself; though he told Eudæmon, he doubted whether his counsel was for the advantage of the Church, since it would occasion the neglect of mutual reproof, and the transgression of that rule of the Apostle, "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them." Sozomen,[1] in relating the same story, observes, that the chief offices of this penitentiary presbyter were, partly to direct such as had need of public penance, how to go about it, and perform it, and partly to impose private exercises of repentance upon those that needed not to undergo the public: and therefore that he was to be both a prudent man, to direct the one; and Ἐχέμυθον, *a man that could keep secrets without disclosing them*, for the sake of the other. He observes further, that when Nectarius had abolished this office at Constantinople, his example was followed by almost all the bishops of the East; but that it continued in use in the Western Churches, and chiefly at Rome, to prepare men for the public penance of the Church, which he there takes occasion to describe in the whole course and process of it.

Now from hence it is obvious to observe, 1. That this office was not set up to encourage auricular confession in prejudice to the pub-

[1] Sozomen, lib. vii. cap. 16.

lic discipline, but chiefly to promote the exercise of public penance in the Church. 2. That it was not of divine, but only of ecclesiastical institution. And therefore, 3. As it was instituted by the wisdom of the Church for good ends; so when those ends could not be served, and perhaps better might, it was at the Church's liberty, by the same wisdom, to abolish it, and to put it down again, as Nectarius did in the East. 4. That the abolishing of it did not necessarily imply the abolishing of public discipline; which still continued in force in the Eastern Church, notwithstanding the abrogation of this office; though, perhaps, something weakened in respect to private offenders; partly because they were not so much inclined to confess; partly because the business of discipline now devolving wholly upon the bishops, as it was before, they had not leisure to attend to it. 5. It is very plain from hence, that there was no necessity laid upon men to confess all their secret mortal sins before they came to the communion; but it was enough, as Valesius ingenuously confesses,[1] for men to search their own consciences, whereby they thought they satisfied that precept of the Apostle, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." And so we have taken a full view of confession, both public and private, so far as it was in use and practice in the ancient Church, beyond which it is none of my province to extend the inquiry, and search after the deviations and corruptions of modern ages, which the reader may find in any of our polemical writers against the church of Rome, or discern them by the account that has here been given, reducing every thing to the primitive standard.

---

[1] Vales. in Sozom. lib. vi. cap. 28.

IV.

INDEX OF COUNCILS, WITH THE NUMBER OF THEIR CANONS.

A.

A. D.

506. AGATHENSE. Agde. in Gallia Canones. 48. al. 71.
315. Alexandrinum contra Arium sub Alexandro.
362. Alexandrinum sub Athanasio.
349. Agrippinense contra Euphratam Arianum.
314. Ancyranum in Galatia. Can. 26.
270. Antiochenum contra Paulum Samosatenum.
341. Antiochenum in Encæniis. Cujus 25 Canones inserti sunt in Codicem Canonum Ecclesiæ Universæ.
578. Antissiodorense. Auxerre. in Gallia. Can. 45.
381. Aquiliense in Italia.
788. Aquisgranense. Aix la Chapelle in Germania. Capit. 82.
441. Arausicanum 1. Orange. in Gallia. Can. 30.
529. Arausicanum 2. Can. 25.
314. Arelatense 1. Arles in Gallia, contra Donatistas Can. 22.
451. Arelatense 2. Can. 56.
813. Arelatense sub Carolo Magno. Can. 26.
359. Ariminense in Italia.
535. Arvernense 1. Clermont in Gallia. Can. 16.
670. Augustodunense. Autun in Gallia. Can. 15.
511. Aurelianense 1. Orleance in Gallia. Can. 31.
533. Aurelianense 2. Can. 21.
538. Aurelianense 3. Can. 33.

B.

540. BARCINONENSE. Barcelona in Hispania. Can. 10.
1431. Basiliense.
563. Bracarense 1. Braga in Hispania. Can. 40.
572. Bracarense 2. Can. 10.
570. Martin. Bracarensis Collectio Canonum ex Synodis Græcis. Capit. 85.

A. D.

C.

394. CABARSUSITANUM. in Africa.
650. Cabillonense 1. Chalon in Gallia. Can. 20.
813. Cabillonense sub Carolo Magno. Can. 66.
381. Cæsaraugustanum. Saragossa in Hispania. Can. 8.
451. Chalcedonense Generale in Bithynia contra Eutychem. Can. 28.
787. Chalcutense in Britannia. Capit. 20.
256. Carthaginense sub Cypriano, pro Rebaptizandis Hæreticis.
348. Carthaginense 1. sub Grato. Can. 14.
390. Carthag. 2. sub Genethlio, Can. 13.
397. Carthag. 3. sub Aurelio Can. 50.
399. Carthag. 4. Can. 104.
401. Carthag. 5. sub Aurelio. Can. 15.
419. Carthag. 6. sub Aurelio. Capit. 10.
419. Carthag. 7. sub Aurelio. Capit. 5.
411. Carthaginensis Collatio inter Cathol. et Donatistas.
747. Clovishoviense in Britannia. Can. 30.
1415. Constantiense.
381. C Politanum 1. Generale 2. Can. 7. contra Macedonium.
536. C Politanum sub Menna. Can. 14.
553. C Politanum Generale 5. de Tribus Capitulis.
680. C Politanum Generale 6. contra Monothelitas.
692. C Politanum, vulgo Trullanum sive Quinisextum. Can. 102.

E.

305. ELIBERITANAM in Hispani. Can. 81.
517. Epaunense. Epone in Gallia. Can 40.
431. Ephesinum Generale 3. contra Nestorium. Can. 7.
449. Ephesinum Latrocinale dictum.

F.

1438. FLORENTINUM.
794. Francofordiense in Germania contra Imaginum Adoratores. Can. 56.

G.

324. GANGRENSE in Paphlagonia contra Eustathium. Can. 20.
517. Gerundense. Girone in Hispania. Can. 10.

A. D.

H.

673. HERUDFORDENSE in Britannia. Can. 10.
393. Hipponense in Africa. Ex cujus Canonibus et Conciliorum sequentium conflatus est Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Africanæ. an. 419.
590. Hispalense 1. Seville in Hispania. Can. 3.
619. Hispalense 2. Can. 13.

I.

524. ILERDENSE. Lerida in Hispania. Can. 16.

L.

361. LAODICENUM in Phrygia. Can. 59.
1215. Lateranense 4. sub Innocentio. 3.
1078. Londinense.
569. Lucense 1. Lugo in Hispania.
572. Lucense 2.

M.

581. MATISCONENSE 1. Mascon in Gallia. Can. 19.
585. Matisconense 2. Can. 20.
845. Meldense. Meaux in Gallia. Capit. 66.
402. Milevitanum 1.
416. Milevitanum 2. Can. 27.
813. Moguntiacum. Mayence sive Ments. Can. 55.

N.

658. NAMNETENSE. Nats in Gallia.
589. Narbonense in Gallia. Can. 15.
314. Neocæsariense in Ponto. Can. 14.
325. Nicænum 1. Generale contra Arium. Can. 20.
787. Nicænum 2. pro Adoratione Imaginum. Can. 22.

O.

1222. OXONIENSE.

P.

847. PARISIENSE.

A. D.

Q.

692. QUINISEXTUM. Sive Trullanum. Can. 102.

R.

439. REIENSE sive Rhegiense. Riez in Gallia. Can. 8.
813. Rhemense sub Carolo Magno. Can. 44.
465. Romanum sub Hilaro Papa. Can. 5.
494. Romanum sub Gelasio.
499. Romanum sub Symmacho.

S.

1022. SALEGUNSTADENSE. Can. 20.
391. Sangariense in Bithynia. a Novatianis de Paschate.
347. Sardicense in Thracia sive Mœsia. Can. 21.
303. Sinuessanum fictitium.
351. Sirmiense contra Photinum.

T.

516. TARRACONENSE. Can. 13.
400. Taurinense. Turin in Pedemont. Can. 8.
400. Toletanum 1. Can. 21.
531. Toletanum 2. Can. 5.
589. Tolet. 3. Can. 23.
633. Tolet. 4. Can. 75.
636. Tolet. 5. Can. 9.
638. Tolet. 6. Can. 19.
646. Tolet. 7. Can. 6.
653. Tolet. 8. Can. 12.
655. Tolet. 9. Can. 17.
656. Tolet. 10. Can. 7.
675. Tolet. 11. Can. 16.
681. Tolet. 12. Can. 13.
386. Trevirense in Germania contra Ithacium.
811. Triburiense prope Moguntiam ad Rhenum Capit. 58.
1545. Tridentinum, continuatum 1563.
692. Trullanum. Vid. Quinisextum.
461. Turonense 1. Can. 13.
567. Turonense 2. Can. 27.

A. D.

813. Turonense sub Carolo Magno. Can. 51.
448. Tyrium.

V.

524. VALENTINUM Hispaniæ. Can. 6.
374. Valentinum Galliæ. Can. 4.
442. Vasense sive Vasionense 1. Vaison in Gallia. Can. 10.
529. Vasense 2. Can. 5.
465. Veneticum. Vannez in Britannia minore. Can. 16.
752. Vermeriense. Can. 21.

W.

1175. WESTMONASTERIENSE. Can. 18.
868. Wortmatiense. Can. 80.

Z.

418. ZELLENSE in Africa ap. Ferrandum. some read it *Tellense*, others *Teleptense:* but *Quesnel* and *Du Pin* reckon it a supposititious Synod.

3286
270.005 J
H394
Henry, P.
[illegible]
270.005 J 3286
H394